National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERCEIVED PARENTAL BEHAVIOR AMONG THAI ADOLESCENTS

BY

© TUANTHONG CHAOWAKEERATIPHONG

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING 1992

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-73227-X

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Tuanthong Chaowakeeratiphong

TITLE OF THESIS: Perceived Parental Behavior Among Thai Adolescents

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Spring 1992

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) T. Chaowakeeratiphong

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Khamphaengphet Teachers' College
Khamphaengphet 62000
Thailand

Date: December 23 1991

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Perceived Parental Behavior Among Thai Adolescents," submitted by Tuanthong Chaowakeeratiphong in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychology.

L. Stewin
Dr. L. L. Stewin (Supervisor)

Dr. D. A. Baine

J Mitchell
Dr. J. J. Mitchell

James Blakey
Dr. J. Blakey

R.G. McIntosh
Dr. G. McIntosh

Dr. R. I. Brown (External Examiner)

Date: December 17, 1991

This study is dedicated to my beloved family.

"Some of us just love each other and
never ask for thanks."

(Rod McKuen, "Some Trust in Chariots,"
In Someone's Shadow [New York: Cheval
Books, 1969])

ABSTRACT

One thousand four hundred and forty Thai adolescents from Grade 7 to Grade 12 completed three research instruments: the Demographic Questionnaire, the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI), and the *Kreng-Chai* Behavior Questionnaire. The study was undertaken to investigate the perceptions of Thai adolescents of their parents' behavior. In order to support the previous findings, the data were factor analyzed to investigate the three dimensions of Acceptance-Rejection, Psychological Autonomy-Psychological Control, and Firm Control-Lax Control in a Thai context. Mothers and fathers were compared in their parenting behaviors. The effects of grade level, sex, socio-economic status, family size, location, and level of *kreng-chai* (attitudes of self-effacement and humbleness, involving the desire to avoid imposing upon someone) were also investigated. The results indicate that three dimensions corresponding to Schaefer's (1965a) three factors of Acceptance-Rejection, Psychological Autonomy-Psychological Control, and Firm Control-Lax Control emerged. Compared with fathers, mothers were described by adolescents as being more accepting, child centered, possessive, positively involved, and accepting of individuation. They were also reported to use more psychological discipline than the fathers did. The findings also indicate that there were overall significant effects of sex, grade level, location, family size, socio-economic status, and *kreng-chai* behavior across all CRPBI-108 scales for each set of parents. Some possible explanations and implications of the findings, and recommendations for future research, were discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was completed with the assistance and support of many people to whom I would like to express my deep appreciation. I extend my warmest gratitude and sincere acknowledgement for the assistance and encouragement given by them.

Special thanks are due to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Leonard L. Stewin, for all the advice, moral and practical support, and valuable time he gave me throughout all phases of my study. Without his encouragement, it is difficult to imagine how I would have reached the end of the tunnel.

My sincere gratitude is extended to Dr. John J. Mitchell and Dr. David A. Baine, my supervisory committee, for their unstinting support, good will, and encouragement. I also thank them for sharing the highest and lowest points of my life during my study in the department. Their concern and fellowship were encouraging.

For their sympathetic, gentle, and constructive commentary, I extend my gratitude and appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Janis Blakey and Dr. Gordon McIntosh. Their support has been greatly appreciated.

I am also profoundly grateful to Dr. Roy I. Brown, my external examiner from the University of Calgary, for his intellectual comments that helped me to remove some of my "blind spots."

Acknowledgement and thanks are expressed to all public school principals and teachers for providing the sample of students for my study. Grateful thanks are also offered to the students who spent much time responding to the somewhat lengthy questionnaires.

I wish to express my appreciation to my friends Peter Edmondstone, Laura Ho, Alice Kienholz, Rama Mishra, Peter Mrazik, Linda Pasmore, and Kalayanee Vorapasu for their comradely support and encouragement during the period of my study in Canada. I also would like to express a deep sense of appreciation to all my Thai friends for their assistance while I was conducting my research in Thailand.

My deepest appreciation is due to my best friend, Dr. Somchai Wongnaya, for his unfailing support and encouragement throughout the study. I also wish to thank him for helping to restore my love of learning.

Finally and foremost, I would like to acknowledge the loving support and inspiration of my beloved family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1. Introduction 1
    - Problem of the Study 4
    - Importance of the Study 7
    - Limitations 8
    - Assumptions 9
    - Definition of Terms 9
2. Review of the Literature 14
    - The Thai Family 14
    - Parent-Child Relations in Thailand 17
    - Child Rearing in Thailand 21
    - *Kreng-Chai* Behavior 24
    - Adolescents' Attitudes Toward Their Parents . 29
    - Studies of Parental Behavior 32
    - Domain of Parental Behavior 35
    - Parental Acceptance-Rejection 40
    - The Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI-108) 46
    - Factor Structure of the CRPBI 52
    - Demographic Information 54
        - Sex of Subjects 54
        - Age of Subjects 55
        - Sex of Parents 55
        - Socio-Economic Status 56

Chapter Page

3. Method and Procedure 59

Subjects 59

Instruments 60

Demographic Questionnaire 60

The Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI-108) 60

The Kreng-Chai Behavior Questionnaire . . 63

The Attitudes Toward Parents Questionnaire 64

Evaluation of the Instruments 64

Back Translation 64

Reliability of the CRPBI-108 66

Relationship Between the Thai CRPBI-108 and the Thai Attitudes Toward Parents Questionnaire 67

Reevaluation of the Kreng-Chai Behavior Questionnaire 68

Data Collection 69

Analysis of Data 70

Question One 70

Question Two 70

Question Three 70

Question Four 70

4. Results 72

Factor Structure of the CRPBI 72

Sex of Parents 78

Demographic and Other Variables 78

Sex of the Subjects 80

Chapter Page

Grade Level 80

Location 87

Family Size 87

Socio-Economic Status (SES) 93

Level of "_Kreng-Chai_" 95

Normative Data for the Thai CRPBI-108 . . 97

5. Discussion and Implications 101

Discussion 101

Factor Structure of CRPBI-108 101

Sex of Parents 102

Demographic and Other Variables 103

Sex of Subjects 103

Grade Level 104

Location 105

Family Size 107

Socio-Economic Status (SES) 108

Kreng-Chai 109

Implications 111

Suggestions for Future Research 112

References 114

Appendix A: Normative Data for the CRPBI-108 128

Appendix B: Scale Reliability Coefficient:
Cronbach's Alpha of the Thai CRPBI-108 . 133

Appendix C: CRPBI-108 Item-Scale Correlations 135

Appendix D: Numbers of Subjects by Region, Province,
School, and Grade 140

Chapter Page

Appendix E: Questionnaires 143

Appendix F: A Brief About Thailand 173

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Numbers of Subjects by Geographical Region and Province 61
2. Rotated Factor Matrices for Males' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior 73
3. Rotated Factor Matrices for Females' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior 74
4. Rotated Factor Matrices for Males' and Females' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior 75
5. Related Factor Matrices for Males' and Females' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior Based on Schludermann and Schludermann's (1971) Data 77
6. Differences Between Fathers' and Mothers' Mean Scores on CRPBI-108 Scales for Males and Females 79
7. MANOVA Table for Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Sex 81
8. MANOVA Table for Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Grade Level 82
9. Multiple Comparisons by Grade Level for Table 7 . . 85
10. MANOVA Table for Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Location 88
11. MANOVA Table for Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Family Size 89
12. Multiple Comparison by Family Size for Table 10 . . 92
13. MANOVA Table for Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to SES 94
14. MANOVA Table for Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Level of Kreng-Chai 96
15. Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-108 Factors Based on 1,440 Thai Students 98
16. Percentile Scores Based on 1,440 Thai Students . . 99
17. Percentile Scores Based on 1,440 Thai Students Broken Down by Sex 100

Chapter 1

Introduction

Children in Western societies and children raised in Thai society view their parents differently. Klausner (1987), an American social scientist and a long-time resident of Thailand, indicated that the economic, social, and geographic mobility of a highly competitive, industrialized Western society resulted in children being separated physically from their parents. Klausner also claimed that there no longer appeared to be a sense of obligation to one's parents. He then stated, "Reverence and respect for one's parents, for one's elders, are not the norm" (p. 311) in Western societies. Minuchin (1974; cited in Kagitcibasi, 1988) added that individual autonomy and separation of self from others with clear boundaries were considered necessary for members of healthy Western middle-class families.

In contrast to the youth in Western culture, Thai youth generally show much more respect toward their parents. Children are inculcated with a strong sense of duty, obligation, and respect toward parents and elders (Bhanthumnavin & Prachonpachanuk, 1981). Parents constantly remind their children to be humble, to be polite, and always to obey their elders. These behaviors then may result in a feeling of consideration for others, especially for their parents (Wichiarajote, no date). Mulder (1990) noted that "respect and obedience to elders, trust in their wisdom and protection, the need to return favours received, all these are strong themes in Thai culture" (p. 64). From the Cross-National Value of Children (VOC) study, which was a cooperative research project involving researchers from eight countries, the researchers also found that Thai parents valued obedience as the most desired quality in children (Hoffman, 1987; Kagitcibasi, 1984).

Klausner (1987) maintained that the different patterns of bringing up children inevitably resulted in differing attitudes not only of reverence and respect for one's parents in their old age, but toward their care as well.

It appears that Thai social and cultural patterns are changing under Western influence. One of the by-products of Westernization is a movement toward an urban, commercially oriented society (Klausner, 1987). The transformation of Thailand into an industrial society will have many beneficial effects on Thai society. In particular, there will be a better standard of living, an affluent and abundant life style, widespread educational and employment opportunities, improved health care, modern transportation systems, countless goods and services, and more upward mobility (Komin, 1989). However, one of the more notable unintended effects of industrialization has been the relationships between parents and children. Wichiencharoen (1978), for example, stated that values in the industrial society create and perpetuate distance between parents and children because relatives in this type of society live separately, and parents want to have time for themselves. He also noted that the younger generations in an industrial society already have a tendency to reject "traditional" values. Suvannathat, Kasemnet, Seedonrasmee, and Lloyd (1986) added that some traditional values have been affected because of the rapid socio-cultural changes. Sons and daughters who used to be passive recipients are becoming more independent. Dependency among relatives also decreases (Theerasasawat & Srisontisuk, 1986). Sinha (1988) stated that "industrialization and consequent urbanization have been the strongest influence in the transformations that have come about in the traditional family structure" (p. 54). Therefore, the influence of Western culture on Thailand and the transformation of Thailand into an industrial society (Klausner, 1987; Komin, 1990; Wichiencharoen, 1976) may affect the attitudes and perceptions of the younger generations toward their parents.

Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) also argued that cultural and social change led to pressures on families to readjust their interaction patterns, including their child-rearing practices. Modern and modernizing societies, for example, which often emphasize individual goals, encourage autonomy for teenagers. High expectations of adolescent autonomy in modernizing society may discourage parents from using firm control techniques. Trommsdorff (1984) concluded that different cultural values obviously determine the way parents actually behave toward their children and the way children interpret their parents' behavior.

The present study, therefore, investigated the perceptions of adolescents of parental behavior in the modern Thai context. The study focused on a sample of adolescents in Grades 7 to 12 from all geographical regions in Thailand, ranging in age from 11 to 19, and from both urban and rural areas. The subjects completed the shortened version of the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI-108), which was developed for use in cross-cultural research (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970a, 1988). This 108-item instrument was used to assess adolescents' perceptions of their parents' behavior along three dimensions: Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm versus Lax Control. For this study, the researcher investigated the three child-rearing dimensions that have emerged from other studies focused on the same sample of parental behavior employed in the present study.

Problem of the Study

Although it appears from Thai studies of child rearing that permissive patterns of child rearing are still favored by many parents (Lloyd & Chuchom, 1986; Suvannathat et al., 1986), there is little information about other types of interactions that may be occurring between parents and their children in the socialization process. Particularly, there are some points of changing emphasis in the role of child rearing that indicate a growing need to have the father more actively involved in it. To date there are no published studies in Thailand that have specifically tried to investigate the three child-rearing dimensions (Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm versus Lax Control) that have emerged from studies focused on the same sample of behaviors. Moreover, there are few studies in Thailand even treating perceived parental behavior among adolescents. Bhanthumnavin and Prachonpachanuk (1981) found that love-oriented practices, reasoning-oriented practices, and attitudes towards fathers and mothers were highly related to the mental health of many types of Thai adolescents. Adolescents from high and middle socio-economic-status families reported that their parents used more love-oriented and reasoning-oriented practices than those from the low economic-status families. In another study with Bangkokian school and university students ranging in age from 11 to 25, the investigators found that the daughters of employed mothers were the least likely to report love-oriented and reasoning-oriented practices by their mothers. On the other hand, the daughters of employed mothers reported that they received more reasoning-oriented practices from their mothers than did the sons of unemployed mothers (Bhanthumnavin & Prachonpachanuk, 1977).

From a review of the literature in Thailand, North America, and elsewhere, the following emerged as the specific research questions with which this study was concerned:

1. Do adolescents in Thailand perceive the behavior of their parents along the following three dimensions: Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm versus Lax Control?

2. Do Thai adolescents perceive maternal behavior as significantly different from paternal behavior along 18 scales used in this study?

3. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of adolescents of their parents' behavior between the following independent variables:

(a) Male and female adolescents

(b) Adolescents in Grades 7 to 8, 9 to 10, and 11 to 12

(c) Rural and urban adolescents

(d) Adolescents from one-child, small (two to three children), and large (four or more children) families

(e) Adolescents from lower socio-economic-status and higher socio-economic-status families.

(f) Adolescents with low and high kreng-chai (as defined later)?

4. What are the percentile norms for the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory based on a Thai sample

of 1,440 students (Grades 7 to 12) who are from all geographical regions of Thailand?

Importance of the Study

The results of the present study will likely provide insight for parents with regard to how they behave toward adolescents and how they may need to adjust their behavior or child-rearing practices. They may consider the conditions under which they can positively influence adolescents' personalities and attitudes. Since the influence of parents over adolescents is related to the perceptions that adolescents have of them (Ausubel, Balthazar, Rosenthal, Blackman, Schpoont, & Welkowitz, 1954), the results will probably be useful to parents who may feel inadequate in their role of child rearers to guide them in bringing up their children.

One of the parental influences on adolescents appears to be identification, the state of wanting to become like another person. Adolescents identify with their parents to the extent that they want to become like them. Winch and Gordon (1973) wrote that adolescents perceived the family as the most influential social system in their lives. Further, McDonald (1980) found that adolescents were most likely to imitate the values and behavior of whichever parent was perceived as the most powerful in the family.

This study focused perceptions on both mother- and father-child relationships; therefore, the results will highlight the differences between the mother's and the father's rearing practices.

The findings about adolescents' perceptions of their parents' behavior may also help school counselors to increase awareness about young people and to come to a better understanding of the nature of parent-adolescent relations as perceived by adolescents from different backgrounds in modern Thai society.

In summary, the findings will ideally enable parents to be more sensitive to how adolescents perceive parental behavior; as a result, parents can be better prepared to respond appropriately and constructively to adolescents' needs.

Limitations

The limitations of this study were noted as follows:

1. The present study was undertaken to examine perceived parental behavior in the Thai context. It must be pointed out that this study was based on perceptions held by Thai adolescents of their own parents' child-rearing practices. How these perceptions would correspond to actual parents' behaviors that could have been observed during adolescents' formative years must remain unknown.

2. Although the three anticipated dimensions of parental behavior really emerged, it cannot be concluded that Thai adolescents perceived their parental behavior only along these three dimensions. There may be some important

dimensions that are not explored in the sample of parental behavior in the CRPBI-108. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the basic factors obtained from the study are affected to a considerable degree by the variety, number, and specificity of instruments that a given researcher somewhat arbitrarily decides to include.

Assumptions

One of the basic assumptions underlying this study is that it is possible by means of a paper-and-pencil test to gather information from high school students that is representative of the perceptions that they actually hold.

The other assumption is that the CRPBI-108 does not assess parental behavior but assesses adolescents' perceptions of their parents' behavior.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the major terms are operationally defined as follows:

Parental Behavior

Parental behavior refers to parent child-rearing practices as perceived by Thai adolescents. The parental child-rearing practices will be assessed by adolescents with the use of the revised form of the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI-108).

The Acceptance versus Rejection Dimension

The Acceptance versus Rejection dimension refers to perceptions of parents as positively evaluating, affectionate, providing emotional support, and egalitarian in their treatments. The rejection end of the dimension refers to perceptions of parents as ignoring, neglecting, and rejecting (Litovsky & Dusek, 1985).

The Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control Dimension

The Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control dimension refers to perceptions of the parent using covert, psychological methods of controlling the child's conduct that do not permit the child to develop as an individual apart from the parent. The autonomy end of the dimension refers to perceptions of parents as not using guilt, anxiety, or love withdrawal to control the child's behaviors (Litovsky & Dusek, 1985).

The Firm Control versus Lax Control Dimension

The Firm Control versus Lax Control dimension refers to the degree to which the parents make rules and regulations, set limits on the child's behavior, and enforce rules and limits. The lax control end of the dimension refers to perceptions of parents as laissez-faire and uninvolved in the child's affairs (Litovsky & Dusek, 1985).

Kreng-Chai

Kreng-chai refers to the attitudes of self-effacement and humbleness, involving the desire to avoid imposing upon someone or embarrassing others in order to maintain social atmosphere and an amicable personal relationship. In this study, *kreng-chai* was measured by the use of the *Kreng-chai* Behavior Questionnaire (Buaklee, 1971).

High Kreng-Chai

A person with high *kreng-chai*, as defined in this study, refers to a person whose *kreng-chai* score is above the percentile score of 75.

Low Kreng-Chai

A person with low *kreng-chai*, as defined in this study, refers to a person whose *kreng-chai* score is below the percentile score of 25.

Family Size

Family size is used to refer to a number of people within the family.

One-child family refers to the family that consists of a father, mother, and one child.

Small family refers to the family that consists of a father, mother, and two or three children.

Large family refers to the family that consists of a father, mother, and four or more children (Withayawongruchi, 1983).

Rural and Urban Adolescents

Rural adolescents refers to adolescents who live in the suburban areas of Bangkok and adolescents from the peripheral districts which are representative of the rural areas of the provinces.

Urban adolescents refers to adolescents who live in the city core areas of Bangkok and adolescents from the central districts of the provinces (Amphur Muang).

Adolescents

Adolescents refers to the sample of Grades 7 to 12 Thai students from 20 public schools. Their ages ranged from 11 to 19 years.

Socio-Economic Status (SES)

In Thailand, there are no established criteria for classifying individuals into class. Therefore, on the basis of the literature review and the suggestions of a number of individuals, the researcher grouped families into higher socio-economic-status family or lower socio-economic-status family by considering the current education, occupation, and income of the father and/or the mother of the subjects along the following criteria.

A family is regarded as being a higher-SES family if it meets at least two of the following criteria: (1) The father or mother is now a skilled worker or is professionally employed; (2) The father or mother holds a professional college certificate or university degree; and (3) The father or mother earns 7,500 baht ($1 Canadian = 21 baht) or more a month.

A family is regarded as being a lower-SES family if it meets at least two of the following criteria: The father or mother (1) is an unskilled or semi-skilled worker or in semi-government service, (2) has high school or less education, and (3) earns less than 7,500 baht a month.

The present chapter has provided the context for the research study. The problems, questions, importance, limitations, assumptions, and definitions of the study have been presented to identify the major issues and to provide direction for the research study. The next chapter is a review of the pertinent literature.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Related literature both in Thailand and in North America (or elsewhere) was reviewed. The related literature from Thailand should help to explain the Thai family, child-rearing practices, and Thai social behavior. This review will be followed by a summary of adolescents' attitudes toward their parents, studies of parental behaviors, domain of parental behavior, as well as the development of the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI-108).

The Thai Family

The family is a major social institution. It is composed of interacting personalities, and its members are all linked to and embedded in the family relationship. There is no other group that is relatively similar to the family in the context of membership formation, nature of the organizational structure, and depth of the relationship. Cooper and Cooper (1990) defined the Thai family as follows:

> Family is the first world. A safe world. A world which is, for the first few years at least gentle, kind and good. It is the world in which an individual learns to obey and respect his elders and betters. The family makes a Thai. (p. 82)

In Thailand, Potter (1976, 1977) found that an average of roughly one third of the households in Thai villages were extended-stem families. Potter defined extended-stem family as the family "in which the youngest daughter and her husband stay home to live with and care for her parents and inherit the house" (p. 151). From his study, Potter concluded that the extended-stem family, not the nuclear family, was the dominant form in rural Thai society. He noted that many ethnographers also found essentially the same extended-stem-family cycle. However, his findings were doubted by some theorists. Moore (1974), for example, stated that the basic socio-economic unit in rural Thailand was the simple nuclear family. Sharp (1963) described the Thai family as consisting of parents and children living together in one household. Moore added that, at times, rural households might become small extended families if one daughter or one son stayed in the family household and inherited the house. Smith (1973) also found that about two thirds of the Thai rural families were nuclear families. He added that the nuclear family was regarded as being flexible enough to include occasionally a widowed parent, other blood relative(s), and even unrelated people. In response, Potter (1976) argued against the contention that the nuclear family was the ideal in Thailand. Rather, he said, the extended family, based on a preferential rule of matrilocal residence, was the basic family of rural Thailand. The rule of preferential matrilocal residence requires daughters to remain in or near their parents' house and to bring their husbands in to live with them. The man, therefore, initially moves to stay with the woman's family and then continues to reside in their house or nearby, usually within the same courtyard. Should the parents still be alive and all her sisters already married, the youngest daughter and her spouse can expect to stay with the woman's parents in an extended-stem household. Although land is generally inherited in equal parts by all siblings, the couple could expect to inherit her parents' house when her parents die (Kemp, 1982; Muecke, 1983; Potter, 1976). Preferential initial post-marital residence with the bride's parents is the traditional norm for rural Thailand (Kemp, 1982; Potter, 1976).

Potter (1976) went on to point out that the matrilocal extended-stem family was the extended family cluster living in a compound. This compound consisted of the cooperating households of the married daughters of a family and their spouses as well as children, who lived near the bride's parents' household, usually in the same fenced-in compound area. He added that the bilateral kindred, the kindred that both father's and mother's sides recognized as equally important, appeared to be a universal feature of Thai villages.

However, Smuckarn (1976a, 1988), a Thai sociologist, argued that the prototype of the Thai family was still the nuclear family. He added that the extended family existed only temporarily. For example, a dependent family would try to save money and to buy its own house and land and thus become independent of the parental household as quickly as possible, and this should be called a temporary extended family (Smuckarn, 1976a). Suphaap (1988) maintained that though there was an increasing number of nuclear families in both rural and urban areas, the extended family still remained in Thai society. Interestingly, when considering the study of the Thai family, one cannot always be sure how a given researcher has defined what we have called "extended family" and "nuclear family." Some of the results are possibly a result of different definitions.

In Thailand, children, after marriage and separation from their parents, still show mutual affection for, and give reciprocal aid to, their parents. The married children are expected to feel grateful for the care they received from their parents (Smith, 1971). They, therefore, very often visit their parents and assume continuing responsibility to care for their parents in both sickness and health (Klausner, 1987).

Parent-Child Relations in Thailand

Thai children are taught to perceive themselves as an integral part of their family. They learn to respect elders and to support and depend on each other within the family. By Thai values, children's inner thoughts and emotions are not expected to be expressed overtly in public. Sangsingkeo (1969) noted that

> Thai children are taught to give high respect and obedience to their fathers, mothers, and elders. When the father dies, the eldest son has to take care of the household and his younger siblings. The first son commands high respect from younger

> brothers and sisters, even when the father is still living. He may have to help in the education and support of the younger ones even when the father is still alive. (pp. 289-290)

Within the family context, therefore, certain patterns of respect exist between a child and his or her parents, the immediate relatives, and siblings. Moreover, the child is not supposed to voice an opposing opinion or talk back to the elders or parents, since it is perceived as lack of respect (Komin, 1985).

Phillips (1965) also emphasized this aspect of junior-senior relationships:

> The attitudes of respect one sees are perhaps distinctively Thai . . . the patterns of respect . . . existing between people, both within and without the family. These patterns are based, in the first instance, on the status inequalities that exist in almost all social relationships: within the family, usually in terms of the relative ages of people. (pp. 32-33)

In Thailand, the mother is mainly perceived as the warm and nurturing figure by the children. The Thai child is taught that the mother is everything. Mulder (1990) suggested that the child is taught about his/her mother as follows:

> Your mother loves you more than anybody else. She has given birth to you; you have eaten from her breast. She has been feeding you and caring for you. She knows what is best for you. You should return her love, be thankful to her, respect her, yet in all your life you will never be able to repay her for the overflowing goodness she has done for you [bun-kun lone loke]. Never, never forget to return the goodness that she has given to you; be grateful and fulfil your filial obligation. (p. 64)

The mother role is, therefore, defined with explicit duties and obligations, whereas the father role is essentially benign protection and support. Children are expected to fear and respect both parents. However, children basically fear their fathers more than they do their mothers (Muecke, 1983).

The bond between mother and daughter is especially strong. Daughters are reared to be mother-role substitutes. They learn household maintenance and share child rearing with their mothers. Consequently, the mother also depends upon her daughter for assistance in raising her daughter's younger siblings.

Relations between fathers and sons may become close as a son begins to work alongside his father in various tasks. In rural areas a father is responsible for teaching his son to plow, fish, and weave bamboo mats and baskets (Potter, 1976). Suvannathat et al. (1986), however, noted that, traditionally, the father was responsible for helping the child with some occupational training and homework. Suvannathat (1981) found that fathers were reported by mothers to be actively involved in child rearing, both physically and psychologically.

The bond between mother and son is even warmer than that between son and father. Sons are reared to complement their mothers. Unlike daughters, who are raised to become mothers themselves, sons are raised to be like a mother's son in his adulthood (Muecke, 1983). A son can gain merit for his parents' souls in the afterlife by entering the monkhood. Every grateful male child is obligated to do so and thus expresses gratitude to his parents. Fulfilling this obligation would bring his parents and himself desirable outcomes in the future life. This goes along with Buddhism, which "teaches that the universe operates on a cause/effect law. 'Do good and you will receive good' is the law of karma. Both the good and the evil a person does are passed on to the future and future lives" (Williams, 1983, p. 6).

As Thai families become smaller, the relationships among family members will become more like those in Western families. As a result, the traditional extended-family structure is being replaced by the smaller unit of most modern families. Klausner (1987) claimed that the different patterns of bringing up children inevitably result in differing attitudes toward one's parents. In urban areas parents spend less time with their children than with their co-workers since they often have to work outside the home. In contrast to children in urban areas, children in rural areas are still seen as having good relationships with their parents (Bhanthumnavin & Prachonpachanuk, 1981; Klausner, 1987). Theerasasawat and Srisantisuk (1986) found that although the rural areas were affected by the cultural diffusion of urban society and mass communication, the family relationship, together with old traditions and conventional beliefs, has changed very little.

Child Rearing in Thailand

In Thailand children are valued highly and are thought to be extremely significant to the parents, especially in the well-to-do families (Smuckarn, 1976b). Most Thai children are, therefore, treated extraordinarily well (Cooper & Cooper, 1990). Thai parents want and love their children. The UNICEF East Asia and Pakistan Regional Office (1982) has quoted a royal message of His Majesty the King of Thailand in the book _200 Years of Child Care in Thailand_ as follows:

> Children are naturally in need of compassion and tender care of grown-ups. . . . It is assumed that every grown-up should deem it as one of his most essential duties to support and provide the young people with the opportunities to possess healthy bodies along with cultivated minds which are adequately and righteously informed on technical as well as moral grounds. (p. ii)

Traditionally, the child was raised in a family surrounded by brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins, and grandparents. These people were ready to cater to the child's physical needs as well as to assist or to provide a role model for the child. Although nurturing was a responsibility carried out mostly by the mother, older siblings, especially daughters, in every family were expected to take care of younger ones. Taking care of young siblings is still seen as part of their life (Amornvivat et al., 1990; Jotiban, 1985; Suvannathat, 1981).

From their study of literature, folklore, lullabies, and documents of child rearing in Thailand, Amornvivat et al. (1990) concluded that the values and concepts of Thai child rearing in the past were as follows:

> 1. Children were taught verbally, through oral communication, aiming at building up obedience.
> 2. Adults were good models for children. Respect for seniority was thus essential.
> 3. Children learned from models and from their relationship with the environment in daily life in their family more than from the systematic teaching and training like the present time. (p. 11)

It appears that in a traditional Thai family, children are taught to obey and to pay great respect to parents and elders. Aggressive behavior is strongly discouraged. To handle the child's aggression abruptly, Thai parents usually employ scolding or threatening of punishment (Bhuapirom, 1985). On the other hand, these traditional values have become less strict as Thai society is changing. At present, relatively well-educated parents are becoming more permissive in child rearing. However, Amornvivat et al. (1990) noted that child rearing in the rural areas still bears the important values held in the past. They also suggested the following values worth pursuing in child rearing at present: obedience and respect for elders, diligence and responsibility, economy, generosity, honesty, gratitude, and self-reliance.

When considering the responsibility of raising children in Thailand, the mother carries much of the responsibility in the care and bringing up of the children, while the father assumes the financial support of the family.

Discussions of parent-child relationships have usually concentrated only on the mother-child relationship. Moreover, there are relatively few studies of father-child relationships.

However, there is a tendency for men, especially from modern urban families, to share equal responsibility with their wives in taking care of their children. Phisalphong and Varindananda (1984) studied child-rearing practices in high socio-economic families in Bangkok and found that fathers of preschool children played important roles in preparing their children academically and introducing them to the outside world by taking them to appropriate and valuable places. Bhanthumnavin and Prachonpachanuk (1981) found that the Thai father was found to play a much more important psychological role than had been previously expected. They also found that the father is more influential than the mother in the son's mental health, while the mother is more so to the daughter. In working-mothers' families, the father is more essential to the psychological well-being of the children of both sexes than he is in the families of non-working mothers. The investigators also suggested that fathers become the main stand-in for mothers who work full time. Amornvivat et al. (1990) also found that the fathers in south and central Thailand would do everything to replace mothers' roles when mothers were away.

When both parents have to work outside the home, the grandmother may take care of the child or give advice. "Grandmothers tend to be the ones who are the most patient to deal with children" (Amornvivat et al., 1990). The grandmother was found to play a more important role than the grandfather in not only looking after young grandchildren, but also conserving and transmitting all kinds of traditional cultural values to young children (Suvannathat et al., 1986).

Kreng-Chai Behavior

One independent variable that has been included in this study is kreng-chai. It is a cultural variable and may also affect the adolescent's perception of parental behavior. Kreng-chai pertains to the relational and reciprocal aspects of social behavior between individuals. This Thai concept plays an integral role in understanding everyday interpersonal behavioral patterns of the Thai.

What is kreng-chai? The word is linguistically a compound construction comprised of two separate words. Kreng means to be in awe of, and chai means heart. When combined--kreng-chai--the word means "to be reluctant to impose upon, to have consideration for" (Klausner, 1987, p. 248). It is important to realize that kreng-chai refers to an attitude predisposing one's resulting behavior toward someone else. Kreng-chai behavior is observed by people in general, including superiors, subordinates, equals, husbands, wives, and close friends. Thai people know how far they can go in expressing the degree of kreng-chai in accordance with different persons, different degrees of familiarity, and different situations (Komin, 1990). Thai people develop kreng-chai in order to maintain a good social atmosphere and amicable personal relationships.

Westerners analyzed kreng-chai as "the feeling and attitude of self-effacement and humbleness, involving the desire to avoid intruding upon or embarrassing others or causing others to extend or trouble themselves" (Phillips, 1965, pp. 49-50), or "respect for superiors with humility and obedience to authority" (Mole, 1973, p. 74). An English sociologist and his Thai wife (Cooper & Cooper, 1990) referred to kreng-chai as the way that the person learned by behaving in a way that openly demonstrated consideration for the feelings of others, obedience, humility, politeness, and respect. Phillips noted that Thais tended to avoid direct expressions and had a tendency to control expressing their emotions. He added that Thais usually were culturally unable to deliver their intentions directly.

Thai people believe that the person who feels kreng-chai towards another has a proper or appropriate manner. To the Westerner, who emphasizes equality, frankness, and directness, the tendency to show deference and avoid imposing upon someone often appears to indicate weakness, subservience, and a lack of initiative (Klausner, 1987).

Thai parents constantly remind their children to be humble, polite, respectful to their elders, careful when interacting with others, and sensitive to others' needs. These behaviors, then, can form a feeling of _kreng-chai_. When one has a feeling of _kreng-chai_ to another person, he may develop a smooth relationship with that individual.

A group of Thai psychologists, led by Wichiarajote started to study this Thai concept in 1970 (Wipawin, 1973). From this study, the group constructed scales to measure the _kreng-chai_ behavior of the Thai people. Wichiarajote (cited in Mulder, 1990), in the study, identified _kreng-chai_ as follows:

> It is a psychological strategy that is used by persons to maintain or to improve the existing social atmosphere, interpersonal relationships, attitudes and one's self-image, through inhibition, such as not following one's personal goals or wishes, or even by going against them. In general [_kreng-chai_] occurs on the side of the person who holds a lower position in respect to another; . . . as a feeling it is often inspired by the fear that the other person will be worried, irritated, lose his kindness, or will lose face. [_Kreng-chai_] is further linked as a core strategic element to achieve an affiliative society that is characterized by a quest for the security of friendship and social acceptance. (pp. 97-98)

From this definition, Komin (1990) suggested that the meaning of _kreng-chai_ proposed by Wichiarajote was unrealistically narrow. She added that _kreng-chai_ was not restricted only to persons of low position toward those of higher positions. We could feel _kreng-chai_ to our equals and our inferiors. She stressed that the word _fear_ should be clearly defined to avoid the misunderstanding and misinterpretation of Thai social behavior. In her opinion, when used in the context of kreng-chai, fear means to feel concerned. For example, "klua waa mae ca pen huang" (fear that the mother will be concerned) means to feel concerned that the mother will be concerned.

Wichiarajote (no date) suggested that there were some disadvantages associated with kreng-chai. He maintained that if people had too much kreng-chai or were extremely sensitive to and concerned about social interaction and relationships, they would have difficulties in terms of making decisions or standing up for their own rights.

When analyzing the data by using factor analysis, Wichiarajote (no date) found 13 factors of kreng-chai, namely, manners, lack of self-confidence, kindness, reserved personality, wisdom to know the occasion, rigidity, affiliative relations, withdrawal, inhibition and face saving, and others--orientedness, social values, seriousness, and pity.

After Wichiarajote (no date) had studied the concept of kreng-chai, there was a vast amount of research concerning kreng-chai, much of it conducted in 1973. The research was conducted with a variety of subjects in Thailand, namely, international students (Buaklee, 1971), Thai Buddhist children and Thai Christian children (Subsomboon, 1973), students from Thai and Chinese families (Preewan, 1973; Srisuthisa-ard, 1973; Sritrakul, 1973; Tangkapipop, 1973;

Wachirasakmongkol, 1973), as well as Thai-Muslim children (Iyaruk, 1974; Patamanont, 1973).

From the studies of kreng-chai, it appears that children from different backgrounds or socializations differ in their degree of kreng-chai. For example, many studies found that the adolescents from Thai families had more kreng-chai than those from Chinese families (Preewan, 1973; Tangkapipop, 1973). Subsomboon (1973) and Patamanont (1973) found that there was a significant positive correlation between mother and children in their degree of kreng-chai.

Klausner (1987) noted that traditional patterns of behavior also break down in a modernized, technological world of business. Although the pattern of traditional Thai behaviors may also be seen to be in transition, kreng-chai is still a distinctive characteristic peculiar to the Thai personality. Furthermore, adolescents from different socializations may also reflect different degrees of kreng-chai. The researcher considers that it is still worth studying kreng-chai, especially among adolescents. The question pertaining to kreng-chai in this study is, "Do adolescents with different degrees of kreng-chai differ in their perceptions of their parents?" Kreng-chai was measured by the use of the Kreng-chai Behavior Questionnaire (Buaklee, 1971), which appears in Appendix E.

Adolescents' Attitudes Toward Their Parents

Adolescents' attitudes toward and opinions about their parents have received the attention of various researchers. Niles (1979) has noted that the attitudes of adolescents toward their parents mirror the effects of conflict, and, even if open conflict is not evident, there is sometimes a greater social distance between adolescents and their parents.

"Adolescents tend to perceive their parents with a critical eye . . . . With an increase in the ability to judge and be objective, they may often become over-critical of their parents, with whom they have had strong emotional ties" (Meijer, 1985, p. 191). From their perceptions of their parents, there will be an acceptance or rejection of parental attitudes. This acceptance or rejection may influence them to adopt similar or totally opposite lifestyles as a starting point (Meijer, 1985).

Substantial research has been done on the attitude of adolescents toward their parents (Amoroso & Ware, 1986; Duncan, 1978; Francis, 1978; Hazzard, Christensen, & Margolin, 1983; Meijer, 1985; Niles, 1979; Rigby & Rump, 1981). One common ambition of the above researchers was to discover the implications of on-going parent-child relationship patterns, as seen by adolescents. "Knowledge about adolescents' assessment of their parents does not allow us as yet to predict their future life style; however, it might bring us nearer to such a goal" (Meijer, p. 192).

Adolescents begin forming their perceptions of their parents at an early age. They learn to describe their mothers and fathers in various terms and to distinguish between their parents' respective roles. "By the age of 4 years children have formed a fairly clear-cut concept of mother as the person who does household chores and takes care of children" (Livesley & Bromley, 1973). Goldman and Goldman (1983), in their study of 835 children in North America, Australia, England, and Sweden, also found that "mother" was seen by all children as predominantly being responsible for domestic duties, caring for children, and working in low-status occupations. In a more recent study, "mothers" were more often described in terms of physical caretaking (e.g., washing dishes, cooking, cleaning house, bathing children, etc.), whereas "fathers" were associated with help-giving and supportive functions (e.g., taking care of children when mother is out, protecting the family, etc.) (Fu, Goodwin, Sporakowski, & Hinkle, 1987). Adolescents often perceive their parents more critically than do younger-aged children. For instance, Neilsen (1987) has quoted a passage from a book written by the adolescents at Fayerweather Street School, The Kids' Book About Parents:

> Here are some of the flaws that we've noted in our parents: being impatient, yelling too easily, being a health nut, embarrassing you in public, having a closed mind, changing their minds a lot, being obnoxious in public, nagging, using old-fashioned words, being a bad cook, forgetting birthdays, acting too sweet, talking loudly, pretending to listen to you, letting people push them around, picking fights over nothing, making

> arrangements with kids and then breaking them, being stubborn, driving too slowly, never being home, being lazy. (p. 356)

Almost 30 years ago, it was found that adolescents showed favorable attitudes toward their parents (Wright, 1962). However, the adolescents' attitudes toward parents have tended to change across time. Coleman (1974), in his study with adolescents aged 11 to 17 years, found a tendency toward unfavorable evaluations of parents. Adolescent males exhibited an increased tendency toward negative evaluations as they increased in age. The trend for girls was similar from 11 to 15 years of age but showed some reversal thereafter.

Rigby and Rump (1981) found that the trend of an increasing proportion of negative (unfavorable) responses from adolescents aged 13 to 17 years concerning parents (Coleman, 1974) was generally supported, but there was no evidence that girls showed more favorable attitudes toward their parents than did boys at any age in the range covered. Rigby and Rump's study was supported by that of Meijer (1985), even though the two studies were conducted in different cultures. He reported that parents who had emigrated from Asian-African countries and were poorly educated were perceived by their high school-aged daughters as authoritarian and ineffective.

In summary, the evidence points to a tendency among adolescents for their attitudes toward parents to become less favorable with age, at least during the early years of adolescence.

In Thailand 30 years ago, adolescents showed favorable attitudes toward their parents (Koedkietphong, 1960). Koedkietphong found that both boys and girls showed more favorable attitudes toward their mothers than toward their fathers. He also found that children's attitudes toward parents became less favorable with age, especially during the later years of adolescence. After a study 14 years later, the results were still the same (Bhanthumnavin & Chareonying, 1974). In the most recent study, Nakavachara and Nathasiri (1983) also found that adolescents showed favorable attitudes toward both their fathers and their mothers.

Studies of Parental Behavior

It is generally believed that parental behavior has a significant effect on the social and emotional development of children. It is also agreed that this process between parents and children is reciprocal (Martin, 1975; Rohner, 1975). Parent and child are sensitive to one another's behavior. Therefore, the actions of one partner may be both a response to the other's last behavior and a stimulus of one's own next action (Kroger, 1983). Theoretically, it might be suggested that parent-child relationships would be broadly affected by parental behaviors, characteristics of the child (e.g., individual differences in attachment behavior), and characteristics of the interactions and evolving relationship between the parent and the child (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979).

Parents are considered to be among the most important environmental influences on children's personality development (Forman & Forman, 1981). It is generally agreed that socialization involves an internalization process by which the child forms his or her feelings, thoughts, and actions after appropriate role models. Baumrind (1967) maintained that

> the young child learns from his parents how to think as well as how to talk, how to interpret and use his experience, how to control his reactions, and how to influence other people. Children learn from their parents how to relate to others, whom to like and emulate, whom to avoid and derogate, how to express affiliation and animosity, and when to withhold response. (p. 45)

The parent-child relationship has long been an area of interest in psychological research (e.g., Symonds, 1939). Many studies on child rearing and its effects have sought to identify characteristics by which parents differ from one another. A number of early studies of parenting employed questionnaires, interviews, or attitude scales to collect information from parents on their disciplinary techniques, typical reactions to specified child behaviors, as well as values related to the child-rearing process. However, using parents as respondents was criticized because of the awareness parents might develop with respect to their own intentions and behavior, the unreliability of retrospective reports, and the limited utility of self-report for clarifying parent-child behavioral contingencies (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

However, there has been a shift in the study of child rearing. The use of children's reports and observations of the parent-child relationship to replace parent interviews and questionnaires has provided a more differentiated picture (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Ausubel et al. (1954) and Gecas (1971) claimed that the most important source of information about child-rearing behavior is the child. The theoretical importance of the child's perception of his/her parents for understanding personality development has been notably recognized (Armentrout, 1971; Ausubel et al., 1954; Forman & Forman, 1981; Graybill, 1978; Hoffman & Lippitt, 1960; Kawash, Kerr, & Clewes, 1985; Kroger, 1983; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985; Schaefer, 1965a; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983). Ausubel et al. concluded that

> although parent behavior is an objective event in the real world, it affects the child's ego development only to the extent and in the form in which he perceives it. Hence, perceived parent behavior is in reality a more direct, relevant and proximate determinant of personality development than the actual stimulus content to which it refers. (p. 173)

Schaefer (1965a, 1965b) has suggested that a critical feature in parental child-rearing techniques might be better indexed by assessment of the adolescent's interpretation of the behavior than by other ways. Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) added that "parental behavior tends to be mediated through the meaning adolescents attach to it" (p. 675). Cox (1970) also suggested that a child's perception of parents might be more related to adjustment than to the actual behavior of the parents. Steinberg (1990), citing Thomas and Thomas (1928), concluded that "if children define the conditions under which they are reared as real, they are real in their consequences" (p. 17). The study of perceptions of child rearing, then, allows one to study parental influences as interpreted by adolescents.

Domain of Parental Behavior

Stogdill (1936) was among the first to attempt the objective measurement of parental attitudes with two questionnaires, which measured attitudes toward parental control and attitudes toward social behavior of children. However, this area of parental behavior has been studied in substantial detail since Symonds' work in 1939. Many studies have attempted to define the parental contribution to parent-child relationships by measuring parental behaviors and attitudes, and to determine source variables by factor analytic or other techniques.

Symonds (1939), after reviewing the literature at that time, suggested two major dimensions of parent behavior: Acceptance/Rejection and Dominance/Submission. Symonds maintained that these two dimensions could be considered as two basic axes along which parental behavior could be ordered. Schaefer (1959) also provided significant conceptual contributions. He analyzed the intercorrelations of variables from a number of studies. A factor analysis of these variables substantiated the notion that these variables could be conceptualized in two dimensional concepts: Warmth/Hostility and Control/Autonomy. These two dimensions were remarkably similar to Symonds' two dimensions. Furthermore, a nearly similar pair of factors was extracted in a factor analytic study (Zuckerman, Ribback, Monashkin, & Norton, 1958) of a parent attitude test: Authoritarian/Control and Hostility/Rejection. A number of researchers (Becker, 1964; Becker & Krug, 1964; Milton, 1958; Straus, 1964a, 1964b) have found convergence upon at least two main factors in an attempt to describe parental behavior.

However, there are a number of studies that illustrate different dimensions. Ainsworth, Bell, and Stayton (1972) have suggested Responsiveness, a factor relevant to Warmth/Hostility. In their analysis of the Parental Bonding Instrument, Parker et al. (1979) found two dimensions: Caring and Empathic/Rejection or Indifference, and Overprotection. Siegelman (1965), using the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire to study perceived parental behavior, found three dimensions: Loving, Demanding, and Punishment. Punishment, by his interpretation, characterizes a parent who often uses physical and non-physical punishment with little concern for the feelings and needs of his/her child, and frequently for no apparent reason. Schaefer (1965a) also reported factor analyses of children's reports of parental behavior and found three dimensions that were similar to Siegelman's three dimensions. In more recent studies, researchers employed the EMBU (Questionnaire on Memories of Child-Rearing Experiences) to study memories of child-rearing behavior of subjects from European countries and Australia. The researchers found three factors: Rejection, Emotional Warmth, and Overprotection (Arrindell, Perris, Eisemann, Perris, van der Ende, Ross, Benjaminsen, Gaszner, & del Vecchio, 1986; Arrindell, Perris, Eisemann, van der Ende, & van Knorring, 1986; Perris, Arrindell, Perris, van der Ende, Maj, Benjaminsen, Ross, Eisemann, & del Vecchio, 1985). The first and second factors are close to Schaefer's dimension of Acceptance versus Rejection. The three factors are also close to the dimensions found by Parker and associates (1979). The original Swedish version of the EMBU used in these studies was developed by Perris and associates (Perris, Jacobsson, Lindstrom, van Knorring, & Perris, 1980).

Since the early studies employing factor analyses, the dimension of Control/Autonomy began to vary and were redefined (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Becker (1964) subdivided the Control/Autonomy dimension into Restrictiveness/Permissiveness and Anxious-Emotional Involvement/Calm-Detachment. Restrictiveness/ Permissiveness, by his definition, is defined at the restrictive end by a great deal of restrictive and strict enforcement of demands in the areas of sex play, modesty behavior, table manners, toilet training, neatness, orderliness, care of household furniture, noise, obedience, aggression to siblings, aggression to peers, and aggression to parents. Anxious-Emotion Involvement/Calm-Detachment, according to Becker, is defined at the anxious end by high emotionality in relation to the child, babying, protectiveness, and solicitousness for the child's welfare. Research based on the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory differentiated two dimensions: Psychological Autonomy/Psychological Control, and Firm Control/Lax Control (cf. Armentrout & Burger, 1972a; Cross, 1969; Kroger, 1983; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983). Employing both observations and interviews, Baumrind and Black (1967) differentiated four dimensions: consistent discipline, maturity demands, restrictiveness, and encouragement of independent contact.

Maccoby and Martin (1983) suggested that the influences of parental control were less consistent than those related to acceptance. Martin (1975) noted that the inconsistencies in results might be attributable to variations in definition. Schaefer (1965a, 1965b), however, suggested that the parental control variable was particularly problematic because the different conceptualization and operationalization could not be equated.

Besides suggesting the breakdown of the Control/Autonomy to form different dimensions, several researchers also suggested other ways of combining different dimensions to gain new parenting dimensions.

Baumrind (1971) conceptualized different ways of parenting in terms of the interaction of the two dimensions: Acceptance/Rejection and Control/Autonomy. In her schema, the authoritative parent is characterized by high acceptance and high control. The authoritarian parent is represented by low acceptance and high control, whereas the permissive parent is represented by high acceptance and low control.

Maccoby and Martin (1983) have suggested the fourfold typology of patterns of parental behavior. They pointed out that examining the combined effects of warmth and control yielded four types of patterns of parental behavior, rather than the three emphasized in most discussions and empirical tests of Baumrind's model. The four patterns of parental behaviors are (a) the Authoritarian-Autocratic pattern, (b) the Indulgent-Permissive pattern, (c) the Authoritative-Reciprocal pattern, and (d) the Indifferent-Uninvolved pattern. Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, and Dornbusch (1990; cited in Steinberg, 1990) also categorized parent behavior into the same four patterns as developed by Maccoby and Martin (1983), and they called these four patterns Authoritative, Authoritarian, Indulgent, and Neglectful.

Although parental behaviors can be described from different aspects, most of the descriptions involve the two dimensions Acceptance/Rejection and Control/Autonomy. Straus (1964a) has proposed that the two basic dimensions could possibly be considered as universals of social structure, or at least the two most powerful empirical variables to emerge in a study of parent-child relationships. In addition, Thomas, Weigert, and Winston (1984), from a review of previous research and their own findings, suggested that parental acceptance is one of the most important predictors of adolescents' identification and characteristics.

Interestingly, when considering the results of the study of perceived parental behavior, one cannot always be sure how a given researcher defines the variables; some of the inconsistencies in results are probably attributable to variations in different operationalization and conceptualization of the samples of parent behavior.

Parental Acceptance-Rejection

There must be a determined effort by parents both to give affection and to achieve enough objectivity to see the child as a human being, entitled to human attributes. A child must be loved in order to develop the general capacity to give love. A child has "a profound, generalized need for positive response (love, approval, warmth, affection) from [the parents]," who are important to him or her (Rohner, 1975, p. 53). It is one thing for a parent to feel acceptance toward a child; it is another thing to make that acceptance felt. If a parent's acceptance does not come through to the child, it can have no effect. A parent should learn how to show his or her acceptance so that the child feels it (Gordon, 1970).

Symonds (1938) noted that those children who were accepted by their parents and were raised in a home atmosphere that was identified as understanding and affectionate, loving, caring, and protective had a chance to develop into well-balanced, emotionally stable adults. Rohner (1975) explained acceptance as follows:

> Acceptance is revealed by a parent doing things to please their children, such as playing with them, comforting them, holding them, cuddling them, praising them, singing lullabies to them, caressing, fondling, and hugging them. Accepting parents generally like their children, approve of his personality, and take an interest in his activities and well-being. (p. 47)

Rollins and Thomas's (1979) definition is relatively similar to Rohner's (1975). They defined acceptance as "behavior manifest by a parent toward child that makes the child feel comfortable in the presence of the parent and confirms in the child's mind that he is basically accepted and approved as a person by the parent" (p. 320).

On the other hand, parent rejection refers to the absence of warmth, affection, or love by parents. It may range from disinterest and lack of concern for the child's welfare to overt expressions of dislike and hostility (Rohner, 1975). According to Rohner, acceptance and rejection are defined by the way the child perceives this parental behavior.

Acceptance/Rejection as an important dimension or continuum of parental behavior has been studied in substantial detail. Acceptance and rejection have been studied both inclusively and separately. However, the studies show consistent findings. For instance, parental rejection has been linked to relate to various behavior problems, such as delinquency (Anolik, 1980; Brown, 1984; Duncan, 1978; Gove & Crutchfield, 1982; Glueck & Glueck, 1950; Jensen, 1972; Kroupa, 1988; Simons, Robertson, & Downs, 1989), drug abuse (Simons & Robertson, 1989), serious criminality (McCord, 1979, 1983; Pulkkinen, 1983), various forms of psychopathology, poor concept formation, disturbed body image, academic problems, anxiety, and insecurity (Martin, 1975; Rohner & Nielsen, 1978). Thus, the finding that parents of problem children were rejecting or hostile tended to be interpreted as evidence that the problem was partly caused by rejecting parents.

Rohner (1975, 1980, 1986) attempted to study the effects of acceptance and rejection on subjects in different cultures and then created his theory, Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PART). His theory can be considered an important conceptual tool valid for all humanity in understanding the parent-child relationship (Kitahara, 1987). Since Rohner's contribution provides a significant theoretical framework in cross-cultural research on perception of parental behavior, his work will be briefly discussed here.

Rohner (1986) defined PART as follows: "PART is a theory of socialization that attempts to explain and predict major antecedents, correlates, and consequences of parental acceptance and rejection the world over" (p. 14). He claimed that his theory was based on the controversial assumption that "human behavior is affected more (but not exclusively) by the way the individuals perceive, interpret, or construe events--that is, by the way they phenomenally experience them--than by the objective events themselves" (Rohner, 1986, p. 25).

Rohner (1975) formulated his theory from his intercultural and cross-cultural study. The study from which he formulated the theory employed the holocultural method. The sample was a holocultural sample of 101 societies. Rohner (1986), citing Naroll, Michik, and Naroll (1980), explained the holocultural research paradigm as follows:

> The holocultural methodology is a paradigm of research for testing hypotheses "by means of correlations found in a worldwide, comparative study whose units of study are entire societies of cultures, and whose sampling universe is either (a) all known cultures . . . or (b) all known primitive tribes." . . . By drawing on a sample of the known and adequately described sociocultural systems of the world, past and present, the holocultural methodology provides a fair representation of the human condition as it is revealed in written ethnographies. (pp. 38-39)

Rohner (1975) found that parental rejection was significantly related, the world over, to children's (a) hostility, aggression, or passive aggression; (b) dependence; and (c) negative self-evaluation, including negative self-esteem and negative self-adequacy. From the results of his study, he formed a theory postulate: Parental rejection has consistent effects on the personality and behavioral dispositions of children everywhere, regardless of culture, ecology, language, or other limiting conditions (Rohner, Rohner, & Roll, 1980). There are many findings which support his conclusion.

Studies within America show that parental rejection is related to a wide range of personality and behavioral problems, including aggression, negative self-esteem, negative self-adequacy, emotional unresponsiveness, emotional instability, and negative world view (Rohner, 1975; Rohner & Nielsen, 1978).

Rohner, Roll, and Rohner (1980) conducted a comparative study among Mexican and American elementary school children. They found that Mexican children perceived their parents as significantly more rejecting than did the American children. They also found that children who perceived themselves as being rejected report more emotional and behavioral disturbances.

Rohner, Hahn, and Rohner (1980), in a study of 16 middle-class and 9 working-class Korean-American families, also found that children in middle-class families perceived their mothers as being significantly less rejecting than did children in working-class families. Moreover, as predicted in PART, they found that children in middle-class families showed more positive feelings of self-esteem and self-adequacy than did children in working-class families.

Saavedra (1980), studying 208 Puerto Rican adolescents, found that adolescents' positive assessment of self-esteem was related significantly to their reported perceptions of parental acceptance; their negative assessment of self-esteem was related significantly to their reported perceptions of parental aggression or indifference.

Starkey (1980) found a direct positive relationship between children's perception of parental warmth and their achievement scores and grade point average: Those children who perceived their parents as more accepting tended to obtain higher scores on achievement tests and higher grade point averages.

In some recent studies, Salama (1987) studied Egyptian undergraduate students. The researcher found a positive relationship between perceived parental rejection and negative personality variables, as reported by subjects reflecting on how they were raised as children by their parents. The investigator suggested that perceived rejection had a persistent long-term association with a constellation of negative personality characteristics.

Kitahara (1987), studying Swedish university students, found that parental rejection in childhood as perceived by subjects was significantly associated with negative aspects of an adult's personality development. The investigator concluded that Swedes were not very different from other people with respect to the parent-child relationship and the child's personality formation and development. Hague (1987), studying Pakistani children, also found that the behavioral and personality dispositions of children were positively associated with maternal warmth. His results showed no social-class differences in children's perceptions of maternal warmth and their perceptions of their own personality dispositions.

It appears that rejection often has serious effects upon personality development. According to Rohner's (1975) theory, it is agreed that acceptance and rejection have consistent influences on the behavioral and personal dispositions of children everywhere, as well as on the personality functioning of adults who recall being rejected as children.

The Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI)

The Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) is an instrument that has been developed particularly to study children's perceptions of their parents' child-rearing behavior. This inventory is one of the most frequently cited and used by researchers (Jacob & Tennenbaum, 1988; Kawash & Clewes, 1988; Perris et al., 1980). The original questionnaire was developed by Schaefer

(1965a). The rationale of such an inventory is based on the assumption that a child's perception of his or her parents' behavior may be more related to his or her adjustment than to the actual parental behavior (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970b).

Schaefer's (1959) selection of parental behavior concepts was guided by a conceptual model that had been developed from his previous factor analyses of psychologists' ratings of parental behavior. From his analysis of the intercorrelations of variables from a large amount of research, he found that variables could be ordered in a systematic circular order or circumplex model. He found that correlations between adjacent variables were high, but taking any one variable as a starting point and moving along the circumplex ordering, the correlations between those variables and the other variables started to decrease, then became negative, and, lastly, became positive and high again when the circle was completed. From factor analysis of the same data, he found two orthogonal dimensions: Love/Hostility and Control/Autonomy. He then developed reliable scales for measuring the concepts derived from the two dimensions and combinations of poles of the two dimensions. The items of each scale were then evaluated by three psychologists with five criteria: clarity of the behavioral description, relevance of the item to the concept, applicability of the item to both maternal and paternal behavior, and high predicted item-scale correlation. He then developed the 26 10-item scales. The subject completes the inventory by indicating whether the parent is "like," "somewhat like," or "not like" each of the items listed. There are two separate forms for the father and mother. To find the reliability and the validity of the instrument, Schaefer administered the instrument to a group of 85 boys and 80 girls ranging in age from 12 to 14 years from a suburban school, and a group of 81 delinquent boys ranging in age from 12 to 18 years. Internal consistency of the 26 scales ranged from .38 to .94. The median reliability that was chosen to sample each dimension was as follows: love, .84; hostility, .78; autonomy, .69; and control, .66. He concluded that the reliability of the instrument was high enough for research on difference between groups. To determine the discriminative power of the scales, Schaefer compared the two scores for each of the 26 scales between the matched groups of normal and delinquent boys. The comparisons were conducted for both fathers and mothers. He found that, of the 52 differences (26 scales x 2 forms), 26 were significant at the .05 level, and 14 were significant at the .01 level. Schaefer (1959, 1965a) concluded that both the reliability data and analyses of group differences suggested that the instrument showed a sensitive method for studying children's perceptions of parental behavior. Schaefer (1965a) factor analyzed the CRPBI and found three dimensions: Acceptance versus

Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm Control versus Lax Control.

Since the questionnaire's original form (560 items, 260 for each parent) is rather lengthy, a variety of shortened forms has been created (cf. Armentrout & Burger, 1972a; Cross, 1969; Kawash & Clewes, 1988; Margolies & Weintraub, 1977; Openshaw, Thomas, & Rollins, 1984; Raskin, Boothe, Reatig, Schulterbrandt, & Odle, 1971; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970b, 1988; Schwarz, Henry, & Pruzinsky, 1985).

Among the revised forms, the two forms that are frequently cited and used are the Armentrout and Burger (1971) revision and the Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a) revision. The Armentrout and Burger form consists of one 16-item scale and five 8-item scales. Margolies and Weintraub (1977) conducted a study to find the reliability of the scales. They found the test-retest reliabilities of the scales ranged from .66 to .92 at a one-week interval and .79 to .93 at a five-week interval. For this 56-item instrument, the norms based on a rural sample of 145 children in Grades 4 to 6 are also available (Fristad & Karpowitz, 1988).

To obtain a shortened version of the CRPBI, Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b) selected 18 scales from the 26 original scales on the criteria of high scale reliability, variability, and applicability to parental behavior. They then selected the items from each scale that had the highest item reliability to form the shortened version of the CRPBI. The inventory was also adapted to cross-cultural studies by eliminating items inappropriate to ethnic, social, and religious minority groups. They later called the shortened form of the CRPBI the CRPBI-108 (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1988). For the 18 scales, 6 scales consist of five items and 12 of eight items. There are two separate forms for mother and father. The revised instrument was administered to two independent groups of university students. The first group consisted of 149 male and 145 female students. The second group consisted of 168 male and female students. The data from the two samples were then factor analyzed separately. The data on the paternal and maternal forms were also analyzed separately. The factors found in the study were similar to those of Schaefer (1965a). Schludermann and Schludermann (1970a) also provided the norms of the CRPBI-108 based on Canadian high school (N=364) and university (N=1,192) samples. The percentile norms for both groups appear in Appendix A.

Grotevant and Carlson (1989) suggested that the research utility of the CRPBI-108 appeared promising, given the consistent factors. They said that the lack of reliability data was a shortcoming of the CRPBI. However, Schludermann and Schludermann (1988) consequently provided the reliabilities as well as the validities of the CRPBI-108. They administered the CRPBI-108 to 446 17-18-year-old university students and then performed both test-retest reliabilities over a one-month period and internal consistency (alpha coefficients). Perceptions of fathers and mothers were calculated separately. Test-retest reliabilities for the 18 scales ranged from .57 to .87 and for the three factors, from .81 to .92. Using the same data, they found the alpha coefficients of the dimensions of the test and retest data ranging from .48 to .60. They also performed the correlation between scales and dimension by pooling the data on fathers and mothers to give 1,837 data sets. The correlation between the CRPBI-108 scales and dimensions ranged from .57 to .93, and -.67 to -.84 for the reversed scales. When they correlated the CRPBI-108 with Olson's Family Satisfaction Scale, they found that the correlations > .20 were significant at p < .0001. They concluded that high family satisfaction was best predicted by high acceptance by both parents in combination with low psychological control.

Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b, 1983, 1988) concluded that the CRPBI-108 provided the same information as the original version. They also provided several advantages of the shortened version quite succinctly:

> (a) The CRPBI has 18 scales that provide a more comprehensive mapping of parental behavior than other parent behavior inventories. It also differentiates clearly between two contrasting methods of control (i.e., FC vs. PC). (b) It assesses separately the behavior of mothers and fathers. (c) Its methodological properties . . . are well established. (d) The three-factor structure of the CRPBI has been found to be highly replicable across samples. . . . Foreign language translations have been found to be appropriate in a

> variety of cultures. . . . (f) The CRPBI factors are congruent to parent behavior dimensions that have emerged from cross-cultural studies with other research methods. (1983, pp. 676-677)

For the purpose of this study and from the advantages of the CRPBI-108, the researcher, therefore, selected the CRPBI-108 as an appropriate tool for collecting data.

Factor Structure of the CRPBI

Schaefer (1965a) is the first person who identified the three orthogonal factors. He administered the CRPBI to three groups of children. The first group was 85 boys and 81 girls from Grade 7 and 80 delinquent boys. The second group was 156 army men. The last was a group of 108 patients and hospital personnel. Schaefer factor analyzed the data and found three factors: Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm Control versus Lax Control. Schaefer's three factors were similar to Siegelman's (1965) three factors: Loving (L), Demanding (D), and Punishment (P) (Goldin, 1969). Since Schaefer found these three factors, many investigators have reported similarities in the factor structure of the CRPBI over a wide range of populations: French-speaking Belgian teenagers (Renson, Schaefer, & Levy, 1968), American college students (Armentrout & Burger, 1972a; Cross, 1969), Canadian college students (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970b, 1988), American children in Grades 5 and 6 (Burger & Armentrout, 1971), American children in

Grades 4 through 8 (Armentrout & Burger, 1972b), American children in Grades 4 through 6 (Margolies & Weintraub, 1977), traditional and transitional Indian adolescents (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983), first-year New Zealand university students (Kroger, 1983), a diverse ethnic sample in Canada (Racz, 1990), normal as well as depressed adults (Raskin et al., 1971), and adolescents in the Hutterite communal society in Canada (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1971).

The three factors, along with the scales, can be explained as follows (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983):

The Acceptance versus Rejection factor is defined primarily by positive loadings on the Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Positive Involvement, and Acceptance of Individuation scales and negative loadings on the Rejection and Hostile Detachment scales.

The Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy factor is defined primarily by positive loadings on the Intrusiveness, Control Through Guilt, Hostile Control, Inconsistent Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, and Withdrawal of Relations scales.

The Firm Control versus Lax Control factor is defined by positive loadings on the Control and Enforcement scales and negative loading on the Nonenforcement, Lax Discipline, and Extreme Autonomy scales.

Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b) concluded that the high degree of replicability of the three dimensions across different forms of the research instrument suggests strongly that children in different cultures perceived the parental behaviors along the same three dimensions. Armentrout and Burger (1972a), Schwarz et al. (1985), and Kawash et al. (1985) also supported Schludermann and Schludermann's conclusions.

Demographic Information

According to the review of the literature of the studies employing the CRPBI, there are a number of demographic variables which affect these perceptions. Some important variables are discussed below.

Sex of subjects. Schludermann and Schludermann (1971) found that girls tended to perceive parents in terms of acceptance and rejection, whereas boys tended to perceive parental behavior in terms of restriction and autonomy. Fristad and Karpowitz (1988) also found that girls reported less firm control and more acceptance from their parents than did boys. Kroger (1983), in his study of New Zealand students, found the same results. Goldin (1969) reviewed the literature on children's reports of parental behaviors by combining features from Schaefer (1965a, 1965b) and Siegelman (1965). He also found that boys perceived parents as being less accepting, exercising more psychological control, and being more punitive than did girls.

However, there were some contradictory findings. Kawash et al. (1985), Crase, Foss, and Colbert (1981), as well as Schludermann and Schludermann (1983), found that sex difference tended to be insignificant. Schludermann and Schludermann, however, suggested that there was only one consistently significant sex difference: Girls reported more paternal acceptance than did boys. They added that Canadian and Asian Indian fathers are perceived as more nurturing and less disciplining of their adolescent daughters than of their adolescent sons. The research considers that sex effects need further study, especially in different cultures.

Age of subjects. Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) found that, with increasing age, adolescents are expected to become independent of parental control. Younger adolescents (13-15 years) consistently reported more firm control and psychological control than did older adolescents (16-18 years). Litovsky and Dusek (1985), studying students in Grades 7, 8, and 9, found that ninth-graders perceived their parents as less accepting than seventh- or eighth-graders. Fristad and Karpowitz (1988) found that children in higher grades tended to report less acceptance from their parents. These results tend to support Goldin's (1969) findings. He found that children report less acceptance in adolescence than in their younger years.

Sex of parents. Schaefer (1963) found that mothers were perceived as more nurturing and more controlling through indirect, covert methods than were fathers. Raskin et al. (1971) also found that mothers were rated as both more positively involved and more directly controlling than fathers. Kroger (1983) found that fathers were reported to be more rejecting and enforcing than were mothers. Mothers were reported as more positively involved, more possessive, and more intrusive than were fathers. Schludermann and Schludermann (1971), in their study of children from the Hutterite communal society, also found that mothers were described by girls as being more accepting and exhibiting more psychological control. Boys, however, did not perceive any such difference between mothers and fathers. They noted that the difference was due to the process of socialization. Therefore, it appears that different socialization may affect the perceptions of children towards their parents' behavior.

Socio-economic status. Goldin (1969) found that children of lower socio-economic status perceived parents as less accepting and more psychologically controlling. Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) also found that Indian adolescents of lower socio-economic status reported more parental psychological control than those of higher socio-economic status. Kroger (1983) found that professional and managerial fathers were reported as being more positively involved with their daughters than were fathers holding clerical, sales, or skilled-labor jobs.

Besides these demographic variables, cultural change is also of interest in studying perceived parental behavior. Schludermann and Schludermann (1983), for example, found that traditional adolescents (Indian adolescents from public high schools that teach a tradition-oriented Indian curriculum in Hindi) reported more psychological control by parents than modern adolescents (Canadian adolescents from high schools located in a western Canadian metropolitan area) did. The investigators suggested that psychological control could be effective only if there was strong two-way emotional investment in parent-child relationships. These emotional ties tend to be strongest in traditional societies, which stress social belonging, and weakest in modern societies, which stress individual autonomy.

It appears that the CRPBI-108 is an appropriate tool for collecting data for this study. The researcher, therefore, selected it as a research instrument.

The review of the literature has brought into focus the research questions. The following emerged as the specific questions with which this research was concerned.

1. It is evident that the three-factor structure of the CRPBI (Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm Control versus Lax Control) has been found to be highly replicable across samples and cultures. As assessed by the CRPBI-108, do Thai adolescents perceive their parents' behavior along the three child-rearing dimensions?

2. It appears that a mother in Thailand is mainly perceived as the warm and nurturing figure by the children. The mother role is defined with explicit duties and

obligations, whereas the father role is one of essentially benign protection and support. As assessed by the CRPBI-108, are there significant differences between fathers' and mothers' behavior as perceived by their adolescents?

3. It is evident that a number of demographic and other variables are related to the perceptions of paternal and maternal behavior. Some of the variables that have been found to affect perceptions of paternal and maternal behavior are as follows: sex of the subjects (Fristad & Karpowitz, 1988; Goldin, 1969; Kroger, 1983; Schaefer, 1965a, 1965b; Siegelman, 1965), age of the subjects (Fristad & Karpowitz, 1988; Goldin, 1969; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983), socio-economic status (Goldin, 1969; Kroger, 1983; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983), family size (Parker, 1983), and cultural and social change (Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983). As assessed by the CRPBI-108, are there significant differences in the perceptions of adolescents of their parents' behavior between the following variables: sex of the subjects, grade level, location (rural or urban), family size, socio-economic status, and _kreng-chai_?

4. There are percentile norms for the CRPBI-108 based on Canadian samples. What are the percentile norms for the CRPBI-1-9 based on a Thai sample?

The method and procedure of this study are presented in the following chapter.

Chapter 3

Method and Procedure

The present chapter contains a description of the sample and research instruments employed in this study. A summary of the procedures of data collection and data analysis is also provided.

Subjects

In order to obtain representativeness in the selection of subjects, the 1,440 subjects were randomly selected from a population of students in Grades 7 to 12 in public schools in the academic year 1991 in Thailand. The public schools are those affiliated with the Department of General Education, Ministry of Education. The respondents' ages ranged from 11 to 19 years. The subjects were selected by performing stratified multistage random sampling. The steps of selection were as follows:

1. Provinces were divided into five groups according to geographical regions. They were northern region, southern region, northeastern region, central region, and metropolitan Bangkok.

2. Two provinces were randomly selected from each geographical region, except for Bangkok (see item 4); therefore, there were eight provinces from four regions.

3. From the eight provinces, schools were divided into two groups according to setting, that is, urban and rural

areas. For each province, two schools, one urban and one rural, were randomly selected; therefore, there was a total of 16 schools.

4. In Bangkok, schools were also divided into two groups according to setting, that is, city core and suburban areas. Two schools were randomly selected from each area; therefore, there were four schools from Bangkok.

5. From 20 schools, one classroom of each grade (from 7 to 12) from each school was randomly selected; therefore, there were six classes from each school.

6. From each classroom, six males and six females were randomly selected.

In summary, there were 1,440 participating students from 20 public schools. Half of each group were city students, and the other half were rural students.

Details about sample size are provided in Table 1.

Instruments

Demographic questionnaire.

The demographic questionnaire was developed by the researcher to obtain identifying data as follows: sex, age, education, family size, family income, parental education, and parental occupation.

The Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI-108).

The shortened form of CRPBI revised by Schludermann and Schludermann (1970b, 1988) was used in this study. The instrument is based on the assumption that the

Table 1

Numbers of Subjects by Geographical Region and Province

		Number of schools			Number of students		
Region	Province	Urban	Rural	Total	M	F	Total
	1	1	1	2	72	72	144
Central	2	1	1	2	72	72	144
	1	1	1	2	72	72	144
North	2	1	1	2	72	72	144
	1	1	1	2	72	72	144
South	2	1	1	2	72	72	144
	1	1	1	2	72	72	144
Northeast	2	1	1	2	72	72	144
Metropolitan	Bangkok	2	2	4	144	144	288
Total		10	10	20	720	720	1,440

child's perception of parental behavior is more influential than the parent's own report of behavior. The subjects were asked to assess both paternal and maternal behaviors. The CRPBI-108 consists of 18 scales (108 items), each describing discrete concrete parental behaviors. The subject has to assess each item in terms of its degree of match to his or her own parents' typical behaviors. The subjects complete the questionnaire by indicating whether each parent is "like" (L), "somewhat like" (SL), or "not like" (NL) each of the items listed. There are separate forms for fathers and mothers, each of which is separately scored.

A value of 3 is assigned to an item if it is judged to be like parents' behavior. A value of 2 is assigned if it is judged to be somewhat like parents' behavior, and a value of 1 is assigned to an item if it is judged to be not like parents' behavior.

The 108 items and their respective scores are also condensed into the following 18 discrete scales pertaining to perceived parental behaviors. Scale scores are obtained by adding up appropriate item scores and then multiplying the sum by a constant. From the 18 scales, 6 scales consist of 8 items and 12 of 5 items. The scales are as follows:

1. Acceptance (8 items)
2. Child Centeredness (5 items)
3. Possessiveness (5 items)
4. Rejection (8 items)
5. Control (5 items)
6. Enforcement (5 items)
7. Positive Involvement (8 items)
8. Intrusiveness (5 items)
9. Control Through Guilt (5 items)
10. Hostile Control (8 items)
11. Inconsistent Discipline (5 items)
12. Nonenforcement (5 items)
13. Acceptance of Individuation (8 items)
14. Lax Discipline (5 items)

15. Instilling Persistent Anxiety (5 items)
16. Hostile Detachment (8 items)
17. Withdrawal of Relations (5 items)
18. Extreme Autonomy (5 items)

(Further details concerning the scales and their validity and reliability can be found in Schludermann and Schludermann, 1988.)

The "Kreng-Chai" Behavior Questionnaire. The *kreng-chai* questionnaire that was used in this study was developed by Buaklee (1971). The investigator originally used it to study *kreng-chai* with international students in Bangkok. The questionnaire is composed of 45 items, classified into five roles: between a student and his/her teachers, his/her close friend, his/her parents, and his/her friend below his/her class, and the person whom he/she feels indebted to. Different situations are used in each role. The student is asked to make his/her own decision of what and how he/she is going to react in each case on the 7-point scale. An example of one of the situations is, "Between you and your parents, would you ask for more money if you did not have enough to spend?" The points on the 7-point scales are given numerical values from 1 to 7. The highest *kreng-chai* is assigned the highest score of 7, and the lowest *kreng-chai* is assigned the lowest score of 1.

From his previous study, Buaklee (1971) found that the split-half reliability of the questionnaire was .78 (n=416). To test construct validity, Buaklee correlated the response form the Kreng-Chai Questionnaire with the Affiliation Questionnaire. He found that the correlation was .71. For the purpose of the present study, the 7-point rating scale was changed to a 5-point rating scale. The instructions and some items were also reworded. The questionnaire appears in Appendix E.

The Attitudes Toward Parents Questionnaire. The Attitudes Towards Parents Questionnaire was developed to assess adolescents' attitudes toward parents' virtue and performance (Bhanthumnavin & Prachonpachanuk, 1981). It is comprised of 20 items. A child responds by evaluating a phrase on a 6-point scale (absolutely not true, somewhat true, less than 50% true, over 50% true, true, and absolutely true). Since each item could be scored from 1 to 6, the total score could potentially range from 20 to 120. An example of a question is, "My father is unfair to me." The alpha coefficients for the father form is .84 and for the mother form is .82.

Evaluation of the Instruments

Back translation. In order to be used with Thai adolescents, the English version of the CRPBI-108 was translated into Thai by five independent translators who were familiar with the nature of the research. The translaters were reminded that the questionnaire would be used with students from Grades 7 to 12, and simple words should be used. The five versions of the CRPBI-108 then were compared. From this, the final version was assembled after thorough checking of any discrepancies and ascertaining that it was in colloquial Thai. Adaptations to the Thai culture were also made with respect to background questions. The Thai translation was then given independently to two bilingual persons. They were asked to back-translate (Brislin, 1970, 1980) it into English without seeing the original English version. The original English version and the back-translated version of the CRPBI-108 were then compared, and discrepancies were noted and corrected. This process was repeated until a satisfactory translation was achieved (the back-translated version matched very closely to the original version). Pilot tests of the English and Thai CrPBI-108 on 30 bilingual adolescents at the Adventist English School in Bangkok established that these two versions provided equivalent information.

The clarity of the Thai translation was established by asking 100 Thai adolescents, 50 at Pracharat Uppathum School in Bangkok and 50 at Maeramat Wittayakom School in Tak, to check that they comprehended all materials, including the *Kreng-chai* Behavior Questionnaire, to which they were expected to respond. There were no changes for the *Kreng-chai* Behavior Questionnaire. The Thai version of the CRPBI-108 was then modified for any necessary corrections to achieve reasonable clarity. There were a few changes in some items. The final Thai version, then, was developed from the responses and criticisms of the pilot groups. For the Thai CRPBI, the format of the English version (instructions, 3-point forced-choice scale, and order of items) was maintained.

Reliability of the CRPBI-108. The Thai version of the CRPBI-108 was administered to 200 students from Grades 7 to 12, 100 from Suppawittayakom School in Maesod, Tak, and 100 from Wat Sangvej School in Bangkok, to estimate the reliability of the instrument by performing Cronbach's (1951) alpha. Cronbach's alpha was derived from internal consistencies among the item responses. The internal consistency of the instrument is "the mean of all split-half coefficients resulting from different splittings of a test. Alpha is therefore an estimate of the correlation between two random samples of items from a universe of items like those in the test" (p. 297). A high alpha coefficient indicates that all items in a scale are sampling the same content area. Alpha coefficients were calculated to determine the internal consistency of the instruments and not to test a specific hypothesis.

Perceptions of fathers and mothers were calculated separately. For the total inventory, the alpha coefficient was .90 for the father form and .85 for the mother form. When performing Cronbach's (1951) alpha for each of the 18 scales, the alpha coefficients ranged from .47 to .85, with a median of .67, for the father form and from .36 to .82, with a median of .63, for the mother form. Details about all alpha coefficients are provided in Appendix B.

For the scales with lower alpha coefficients, the translation was carefully rechecked for clarity. There were very few changes in the items. The alpha coefficients were higher for eight-item scales than for five-item scales. The scales with low alpha coefficients, therefore, may well be attributable to the relatively smaller number of items which make up the scales, or may be due to the revision itself.

To check the internal consistency of the Thai CRPBI-108, item-total scale correlations were also computed for each item and for the scales to which the item contributed. All items were significantly correlated ($p<.001$) with the appropriate scales, and no item was rejected. The correlations ranged from .40 to .80, with a median of .64, for the father form and .43 to .76, with a median of .60, for the mother form. The Thai CRPBI-108 item-scale correlations appear in Appendix C.

Relationship between the Thai CRPBI-108 and the Attitudes Toward Parents Questionnaire. Campbell (1960) noted that one way to demonstrate construct validity was to show that a test correlated with other variables with which it should theoretically correlate. In order to test for construct validity, correlations were computed between the CRPBI-108 scales and a measure of the Attitudes Toward Parents Questionnaire. The correlations of the Attitudes Toward Parents Questionnaire and the Acceptance factor of the CRPBI were .54 ($p<.001$) for the father and .54 ($p<.001$) for the mother, respectively. The Acceptance factor scores thus provide a measure of convergent validity when correlated with the Attitude Toward Parents Questionnaire.

Both the mother's and the father's Acceptance factor scores were positively correlated with the subjects' attitude scores. As expected, subjects who perceived their parents as showing acceptance toward them had positive attitudes toward their parents.

Reevaluation of the "Kreng-Chai" Behavior Questionnaire. For the purpose of this study, the sample of 200 students in Grades 7 to 12, 100 from Suppawittayakom School in Maesod, Tak, and 100 from Wat Sangvej School in Bangkok, were asked to complete the questionnaire. The reliability of the questionnaire was then reevaluated. By performing Cronbach's (1951) alpha, the researcher found that the alpha coefficient of the questionnaire for all 200 students was .77, which was very close to the reliability coefficient found by Buaklee (.78). The reliability of the questionnaire was also estimated separately for the rural adolescents in Tak and the urban adolescents in Bangkok. The alpha coefficients for both groups were .73 and .80, respectively.

Data Collection

Permission to administer the questionnaires within all schools used in this study was obtained by means of letters and direct contact with the school principals. Once the permission to administer the questionnaires had been granted, further arrangements were made with the school principals or school teachers. These arrangements would allow the researcher, research assistants, or school teachers to administer the questionnaires to groups of students during regular class periods.

Students were given some brief instructions with regard to completion of the demographic questionnaire and the two other questionnaires: the CRPBI-108 and the Kreng-Chai Questionnaire. The students were reminded to finish the demographic part first. In addition to those instructions that appeared in printed form on the questionnaire itself, students were requested to check over the questionnaire once they responded to every item. Students were also told that the researcher, the research assistant, or the school teacher would explain to them any item with which they had difficulty. No time limit was imposed for completing the questionnaires. In order to maintain anonymity, the students were not required to identify themselves.

The subjects took about 50-60 minutes to complete the entire set of questionnaires. Students in the lower grades spent more time than those in the higher ones. The researcher, the research assistants, and the school teachers found that there were no difficulties in administering the questionnaire and that the subjects apparently understood the questions.

Analysis of Data

Question one. For question one, the principal component, factor analysis using ones in the diagonals as communality, was computed separately for boys and for girls, as well as for both boys and girls (pooling the data). The six-factor analysis consisted of male-mother, male-father, female-mother, female-father, male and female-mother, and male and female-father.

Question two. For question two, child-rearing practices were explored in comparisons between parents on each of the 18 CRPBI scales by the use of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).

Question three. For question three, since there was more than one scale on the different variables, the main test for group differences in the independent variables was also made by means of MANOVA. The MANOVA was then followed by univariate F-tests comparing all groups on each of the CRPBI scales and the dimensions. Subsequently, if the univariate F-tests showed a significant result, pair-wise between-group comparisons (Scheffe) then were conducted. The working alpha was set at .05.

Question four. For the norming procedure, the percentile score of the CRPBI-108 was performed on both the father and mother separately for boys and girls. The norming procedure started from the factor scores for each dimension (Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, and Firm Control versus Lax Control) and were computed by the scoring instructions provided by Schludermann and Schludermann (1988). Then the percentile scores for the corresponding factor scores were calculated.

The results of the study are presented in the following chapter.

Chapter 4

Results

This chapter presents the results of the responses of 1,440 Thai adolescents. Hereafter, the researcher refers to the research questions. The chapter contains the following components: factor structure of the CRPBI-108, sex of parents, demographic and other variables, and normative data for the Thai CRPBI-108.

Factor Structure of the CRPBI

In the present study, the factor structure of the 18 CRPBI scales for each parent of Thai adolescents was examined to see how the results compared with earlier administrations of the instrument. Six factor analyses (male-father, male-mother, female-father, female-mother, male and female-father, as well as male and female-mother) were performed. The six correlation matrices of the 18 x 18 scale scores were factor analyzed by the principal component methods. Factors with eigenvalues of one or greater were extracted and rotated through the Varimax solution. A meaningful factor loading was set at 0.40 (Arrindel et al., 1983; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970b, 1971).

Tables 2 to 4 indicate the scales defining each factor and their loadings. Three Varimax factors were obtained from each analysis. The factors pertaining to mothers and fathers were quite similar in composition. For data shown

Table 2

Related Factor Matrices for Males' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior

	Father factors			Mother factors		
Scale	I	II	III	I	II	III
Acceptance	.88	-.11	.16	.84	.24	.12
Child centeredness	.86	-.06	.09	.80	.33	.07
Possessiveness	.80	.24	-.01	.50	.58	.08
Rejection	-.52	.68	.11	-.80	.30	.17
Control	.35	.66	-.19	.02	.75	-.17
Enforcement	.00	.78	-.17	-.29	.72	-.17
Positive involvement	.89	.07	.11	.77	.42	.08
Intrusiveness	.57	.50	-.11	.23	.68	-.08
Control through guilt	.67	.44	-.02	.34	.68	.05
Hostile control	.13	.80	-.14	-.37	.75	.02
Inconsistent discipline	-.17	.66	.26	-.46	.47	.31
Nonenforcement	-.18	.07	.79	-.16	-.16	.76
Acceptance of individuation	.78	.02	.23	.71	.26	.30
Lax discipline	.08	-.02	.79	.08	-.17	.77
Instilling persistent anxiety	-.01	.78	-.05	-.42	.65	.07
Hostile detachment	-.46	.68	.16	-.73	.36	.19
Withdrawal of relations	-.35	.61	.17	-.45	.41	.20
Extreme autonomy	-.02	-.03	.78	.11	-.15	.74
Percentage of total variance	28.6	25.3	12.1	27.1	24.4	11.7

Table 3

Related Factor Matrices for Females' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior

Scale	Father factors			Mother factors		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
Acceptance	.88	.05	.17	.84	.24	.12
Child centeredness	.87	.14	.14	.80	.33	.07
Possessiveness	.72	.41	.09	.50	.58	.08
Rejection	-.76	.46	.11	-.80	.30	.17
Control	.11	.79	-.07	.01	.75	-.17
Enforcement	-.18	.79	-.14	-.29	.72	-.17
Positive involvement	.85	.26	.20	.77	.42	.08
Intrusiveness	.42	.64	-.05	.23	.68	-.08
Control through guilt	.50	.60	.08	.34	.68	.05
Hostile control	-.10	.84	-.06	-.37	.75	.02
Inconsistent discipline	-.40	.57	.33	-.46	.47	.31
Nonenforcement	-.39	-.11	.72	-.16	-.16	.76
Acceptance of individuation	.74	.14	.39	.71	.26	.30
Lax discipline	-.05	-.15	.81	.08	-.17	.77
Instilling persistent anxiety	-.26	.74	-.04	-.42	.65	.07
Hostile detachment	-.74	.42	.16	-.73	.36	.19
Withdrawal of relations	-.40	.55	.21	-.45	.41	.20
Extreme autonomy	-.14	-.19	.77	.11	-.15	.74
Percentage of total variance	30.5	25.7	12.5	27.1	24.4	11.7

Table 4

Related Factor Matrices for Males' and Females' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior

	Father factors			Mother factors		
Scale	I	II	III	I	II	III
Acceptance	.88*	.03	.17	.84*	.24	.12
Child centeredness	.87*	.09	.12	.80*	.33	.07
Possessiveness	.74*	.38	.04	.50*	.58	.08
Rejection	-.69	.53	.11	-.80	.30	.17
Control	.18	.75*	-.13	.01	.75*	-.17
Enforcement	-.15	.78*	-.16	-.29	.72*	-.17
Positive involvement	.86*	.22	.15	.77*	.42	.08
Intrusiveness	.45	.61*	-.08	.23	.68*	-.08
Control through guilt	.56	.57*	.03	.34	.68*	.05
Hostile control	-.04	.83*	-.10	-.37	.75*	.02
Inconsistent discipline	-.33	.60*	.29	-.46	.47*	.31
Nonenforcement	-.30	-.03	.76*	-.16	-.16	.76*
Acceptance of individuation	.76*	.13	.32	.71*	.26	.30
Lax discipline	.01	-.07	.81*	.08	-.17	.77*
Instilling persistent anxiety	-.19	.75*	-.05	-.42	.65*	.07
Hostile detachment	-.65	.52	.16	-.73	.36	.19
Withdrawal of relations	-.40	.55*	.18	-.45	.41*	.20
Extreme autonomy	-.09	-.10	.77*	.11	-.14	.74*
Percentage of total variance	29.4	25.4	12.3	27.1	24.4	11.7

* Indicates scales that load on the same factor as in Schludermann and Schludermann (1971).

in Table 4, the three factors account for 67.1% of the total variance for fathers and 63.2% for mothers. Factor I, which accounts for 29.4% and 27.1% of the total variance on the father and mother scales, respectively, shows high positive loadings on Acceptance (.88, .84), Child Centeredness (.87, .80), Positive Involvement (.86, .77), and Acceptance of Individuation (.76, .71). This factor shows high negative loadings on Rejection (-.69, -.80) and Hostile Detachment (-.65, -.73). Factor II, which accounts for 25.4% and 24.4% of the total variance on the father and mother scales, respectively, shows high positive loadings on Control (.75, .75), Enforcement (.78, .72), Intrusiveness (.61, .68), Hostile Control (.83, .75), and Instilling Persistent Anxiety (.75, .65). Factor III, which accounts for 12.3% and 11.7% of the total variance on the father and mother scales, respectively, shows high positive loadings on Nonenforcement (.76, .76), Lax Discipline (.81, .77), and Extreme Autonomy (.77, .74).

The factor structure presented corresponds rather closely to that of Schludermann and Schludermann (1971) in Table 5 and those obtained from earlier administration of the inventory. Therefore, the names of Schaefer's (1965a) and Schludermann and Schludermann's basic dimensions will be used to identify them.

Table 5

Rotated Factor Matrices for Males' and Females' Reports of Paternal and Maternal Behavior Based on Schludermann and Schludermann's (1971) Data

	Factors		
Scale	I	II	III
Acceptance	.83	.16	-.20
Child centeredness	.85	.17	-.03
Possessiveness	.56	.50	.15
Rejection	-.18	.33	.79
Control	.31	.72	-.15
Enforcement	.06	.64	.23
Positive involvement	.85	.24	-.08
Intrusiveness	.32	.66	.13
Control through guilt	.30	.70	.10
Hostile control	.19	.75	.29
Inconsistent discipline	-.04	.43	.67
Nonenforcement	-.08	.11	.76
Acceptance of individuation	.69	.02	.05
Lax discipline	.48	.07	.62
Instilling persistent anxiety	-.09	.74	.19
Hostile detachment	-.26	.31	.77
Withdrawal of relations	-.05	.53	.54
Extreme autonomy	.28	-.21	.71

Sex of Parents

Comparison between maternal and paternal behavior were made between mean scores for fathers and mean scores for mothers of each scale by the use of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The means between the parents and the F values are presented in Table 6.

Results of MANOVA, F (18, 1421), in Table 6 indicate that there are significant overall differences between paternal and maternal behavior ($F = 26.06$, $p < .001$). The univariate analysis tests, F (1, 1438), show significant differences in mean scores on 16 of the 18 scales. Mother means are significantly higher ($p < .001$) than father means on the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Control, Positive Involvement, Intrusiveness, Control Through Guilt, Hostile Control, Acceptance of Individuation, and Instilling Persistent Anxiety. Father means are significantly higher ($p < .001$ to $p < .01$) than mother means on the following scales: Rejection, Inconsistent Discipline, Nonenforcement, Lax Discipline, Hostile Detachment, and Extreme Autonomy.

Demographic and Other Variables

Six multivariate analyses for perception of paternal behaviors were performed on the 18 scales according to sex, location (rural or urban), grade level (7-8, 9-10, or 11-12), family size (one-child, small, or large), socio-economic status (high or low), and level of *kreng-chai* (high

Table 6

Differences Between Fathers' and Mothers' Mean Scores on CRPBI-108 Scales for Males and Females

	Father		Mother		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	22.43	4.98	23.76	4.18	26.60***	135.81***
Child centeredness	22.60	5.21	23.76	4.52		94.27***
Possessiveness	21.32	4.72	22.40	3.99		100.78***
Rejection	14.12	4.02	13.79	3.53		10.48**
Control	18.75	4.27	19.28	3.89		26.46***
Enforcement	15.67	3.97	15.83	3.50		2.63
Positive involvement	20.52	4.75	21.46	4.20		90.84***
Intrusiveness	19.57	5.24	20.15	4.58		25.52***
Control through guilt	20.85	4.93	22.47	4.32		217.81***
Hostile control	17.99	3.91	18.79	3.64		69.53***
Inconsistent discipline	14.47	3.89	14.21	3.64		7.15**
Nonenforcement	15.06	3.88	14.38	3.31		47.82***
Acceptance of individuation	22.00	4.26	22.35	3.95		11.91***
Lax discipline	16.40	3.72	16.09	3.44		9.74**
Instilling persistent anxiety	17.09	4.32	17.76	4.23		39.03***
Hostile detachment	15.14	3.91	14.26	3.40		93.60***
Withdrawal of relations	13.98	4.49	14.21	4.30		3.81
Extreme autonomy	16.06	4.43	15.56	3.99		25.59***

** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

or low). Similarly, six more multivariate analyses for perception of maternal behaviors were performed on the 18 scales according to the same independent variables. The F values for the above analyses are presented in Tables 7 to 14.

Sex of the subjects. Results of the MANOVA, F (18, 1421), in Table 7 indicate significant overall differences in the perception of fathers' and mothers' behavior between male and female adolescents (F = 7.13, p < .001, F = 5.75, p < .001, respectively). For fathers, the univariate analysis tests, F (1, 1438), for each scale show significant results (p < .001 to .01) in the following scales: Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Enforcement, Hostile Control, Inconsistent Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, and Extreme Autonomy. Father means of female adolescents are higher than those of male adolescents in the Child Centeredness and Possessiveness scales. For mothers, the univariate analysis tests, F (1, 1438), for each scale show significant results (p < .001 to .05) in the following scales: Child Centeredness, Inconsistent Discipline, Nonenforcement, Withdrawal of Relations, and Extreme Autonomy. Mother means of female adolescents are higher than those of male adolescents in the Child Centeredness and Withdrawal of Relations scales.

Grade level. Results of the MANOVA, F (36, 2840), in Table 8 indicate that there are significant overall differences in the perception of fathers' and mothers'

Table 7

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Sex

	Fathers						Mothers					
	Sex						Sex					
	Male^a		Female^b		Multi-variate	Uni-variate	Male		Female		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	22.21	4.85	22.68	5.10	7.13***	2.92	23.55	4.08	23.98	4.27	5.75***	3.80
Child centeredness	22.13	5.08	23.08	5.30		11.99***	23.47	4.40	24.06	4.61		6.14*
Possessiveness	20.94	4.66	21.71	4.77		9.67**	22.22	4.05	22.57	3.92		2.77
Rejection	14.14	3.82	14.10	4.21		.04	13.74	3.33	13.85	3.71		.31
Control	18.85	4.27	18.65	4.26		.83	19.30	3.87	19.26	3.90		.04
Enforcement	16.06	4.03	15.27	3.87		14.44***	15.89	3.47	15.77	3.54		.44
Positive involvement	20.29	4.51	20.75	4.97		3.31	21.47	4.04	21.46	4.35		.00
Intrusiveness	19.76	5.25	19.39	5.23		1.85	20.32	4.66	19.98	4.50		1.94
Control through guilt	20.67	4.70	21.04	5.14		2.00	22.39	4.28	22.55	4.37		.48
Hostile control	18.28	3.80	17.70	4.00		7.82**	18.82	3.56	18.75	3.72		.17
Inconsistent discipline	14.74	3.90	14.21	3.86		6.81**	14.43	3.69	13.99	3.57		5.39*
Nonenforcement	15.09	3.73	15.04	4.02		.06	14.57	3.35	14.19	3.25		4.64*
Acceptance of individuation	21.82	4.20	22.18	4.32		2.54	22.35	3.79	22.35	4.11		.00
Lax discipline	16.24	3.67	16.56	3.76		2.76	16.14	3.58	16.03	3.29		.39
Instilling persistent anxiety	17.38	4.25	16.79	4.36		6.73**	17.79	4.22	17.72	4.24		.10
Hostile detachment	15.27	3.80	15.02	4.03		1.49	14.34	3.25	14.18	3.53		.76
Withdrawal of relations	13.83	4.27	14.13	4.69		1.70	13.82	3.99	14.60	4.55		12.06***
Extreme autonomy	16.53	4.57	15.58	4.25		16.91***	16.15	4.22	14.97	3.65		32.42***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

$^a n = 720$. $^b n = 720$.

Table 8

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Grade Level

	Fathers							
	Grade level							
	7-8[a]		9-10[b]		11-12[c]		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	23.32	4.66	22.33	5.03	21.65	5.10	4.35***	14.12***
Child centeredness	23.23	4.95	22.39	5.37	22.18	5.25		5.53**
Possessiveness	21.88	4.79	21.33	4.66	20.75	4.66		6.86***
Rejection	13.78	3.79	14.28	4.06	14.30	4.19		2.55
Control	19.33	4.32	18.74	4.25	18.18	4.17		8.80***
Enforcement	15.91	3.77	15.67	4.03	15.43	4.10		1.75
Positive involvement	21.42	4.61	20.45	4.75	19.70	4.74		16.20***
Intrusiveness	19.74	5.08	19.49	5.17	19.49	5.47		.35
Control through guilt	21.27	4.99	20.73	4.77	20.56	5.00		2.73
Hostile control	18.34	3.67	17.98	3.88	17.65	4.14		3.82*
Inconsistent discipline	14.05	3.72	14.69	3.79	14.69	4.11		4.19*
Nonenforcement	14.60	3.62	15.22	3.97	15.37	4.00		5.29**
Acceptance of individuation	22.35	4.08	21.83	4.32	21.83	4.37		2.44
Lax discipline	16.00	3.53	16.46	3.71	16.74	3.87		4.85**
Instilling persistent anxiety	16.81	4.21	17.28	4.36	17.18	4.38		1.55
Hostile detachment	14.68	3.59	15.30	4.06	15.46	4.04		5.34**
Withdrawal of relations	13.23	3.80	14.03	4.61	14.69	4.86		13.01***
Extreme autonomy	15.23	3.93	16.18	4.42	16.78	4.78		15.21***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

[a]$n = 480$. [b]$n = 480$. [c]$n = 480$.

Table 8 (Continued)

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Grade Level

Scale	Mothers							
	Grade level							
	7-8[a]		9-10[b]		11-12[c]		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	24.50	3.66	23.67	4.23	23.12	4.49	6.75***	13.49***
Child centeredness	24.48	4.07	23.73	4.66	23.08	4.70		11.65***
Possessiveness	22.90	3.92	22.47	3.95	21.83	4.03		8.86***
Rejection	13.25	3.02	13.93	3.43	14.20	3.99		9.37***
Control	20.23	3.75	19.05	3.70	18.57	4.02		23.84***
Enforcement	16.53	3.48	15.62	3.44	15.35	3.50		15.18***
Positive involvement	22.54	3.82	21.44	4.24	20.40	4.26		32.56***
Intrusiveness	20.41	4.62	20.18	4.55	19.86	4.53		1.77
Control through guilt	22.86	4.30	22.50	4.16	22.05	4.50		4.28*
Hostile control	19.13	3.53	18.72	3.54	18.51	3.81		3.57*
Inconsistent discipline	14.13	3.52	14.36	3.69	14.13	3.70		.65
Nonenforcement	13.97	3.24	14.28	3.20	14.90	3.42		10.02***
Acceptance of individuation	22.56	3.71	22.35	4.10	22.12	4.02		1.48
Lax discipline	15.33	3.35	16.20	3.27	16.73	3.55		20.72***
Instilling persistent anxiety	17.52	4.32	17.99	4.12	17.77	4.24		1.52
Hostile detachment	14.03	3.12	14.19	3.30	14.56	3.72		3.08
Withdrawal of relations	13.70	4.06	14.20	4.27	14.74	4.50		7.06**
Extreme autonomy	14.69	3.47	15.65	4.06	16.34	4.22		21.45***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

[a]n = 480. [b]n = 480. [c]n = 480.

behavior among adolescents in Grades 7 to 8, 9 to 10, and 11 to 12 (F = 4.35, $p < .001$, F = 6.75, $p < .001$, respectively). Univariate analysis tests, F (2, 1437), applied to the father scales yield significant F-scores ($p < .001$ to .05) for the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Control, Positive Involvement, Hostile Control, Inconsistent Discipline, Nonenforcement, Lax Discipline, Hostile Detachment, Withdrawal of Relations, and Extreme Autonomy.

For mothers, the univariate analysis tests, F (2, 1437), applied to mother scales yield significant F-scores ($p < .001$ to .05) for the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Rejection, Control, Enforcement, Positive Involvement, Control Through Guilt, Hostile Control, Nonenforcement, Lax Discipline, Withdrawal of Relations, and Extreme Autonomy. Pair-wise between-group comparisons (Scheffe) were conducted to determine the direction of grade-level differences. The working alpha was set at .05. Table 9 displays the significant differences for scale scores found in multiple comparisons between grade levels.

Results from post hoc Scheffe comparisons ($p < .05$) show that means of fathers of the seventh and eighth graders are significantly greater than those of fathers of the ninth and tenth graders and of the eleventh and twelfth graders on the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, and Positive Involvement. They were also greater than means of

Table 9

Multiple Comparisons by Grade Levels for Table 8

Scale	Father	Mother
Acceptance	1>2, 1>3[a]	1>2, 1>3
Child centeredness	1>2, 1>3	1>2, 1>3
Possessiveness	1>3	1>3, 2>3
Rejection	--	2>1, 3>1
Control	1>3	1>2, 1>3
Enforcement	--	1>2, 1>3
Positive involvement	1>2, 1>3, 2>3	1>2, 1>3, 2>3
Intrusiveness	--	--
Control through guilt	--	1>3
Hostile control	1>3	1>3
Inconsistent discipline	2>1, 3>1	--
Nonenforcement	2>1, 3>1	3>1, 3>2
Acceptance of individuation	--	--
Lax discipline	3>1	2>1, 3>1
Instilling persistent anxiety	--	--
Hostile detachment	2>1, 3>1	--
Withdrawal of relations	2>1, 3>1	3>1
Extreme autonomy	2>1, 3>1	2>1, 3>1, 3>2

[a] 1 = Grades 7-8, 2 = Grades 9-10, 3 = Grades 11-12

fathers of the eleventh and twelfth graders on the Possessiveness, Control, and Hostile Control scales. The mean of fathers of the ninth and tenth graders is higher than the mean of fathers of the eleventh and twelfth graders on the Positive Involvement scale. Means of fathers of the ninth and tenth graders as well as of the eleventh and twelfth graders are significantly greater than those of fathers of the seventh and eighth graders on the following scales: Inconsistent Discipline, Nonenforcement, Hostile Detachment, Withdrawal of Relations, and Extreme Autonomy. The mean of fathers of the eleventh and twelfth graders is significantly higher than is the mean of fathers of the seventh and eighth graders on the Lax Discipline scale.

Means of mothers of the seventh and eighth graders are significantly higher than are those of mothers of the ninth and tenth graders and eleventh and twelfth graders on the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Control, Enforcement, and Positive Involvement. Means of mothers of the seventh and eighth graders are also greater than those of mothers of the eleventh and twelfth graders on the Possessiveness, Control Through Guilt, and Hostile Control scales. Means of mothers of the ninth and tenth graders and eleventh and twelfth graders are significantly higher than are those of mothers of the seventh and eighth graders on the Rejection, Lax Discipline, and Extreme Autonomy scales. Means of mothers of the eleventh and twelfth graders are significantly higher than are those of the mothers of the seventh and eighth graders on the Nonenforcement and Withdrawal of Relations scales and of the mothers of the ninth and tenth graders on the Nonenforcement and Extreme Autonomy scales. The mean of mothers of the ninth and tenth graders is significantly higher than the mean of the mothers of the eleventh and twelfth graders on the Possessiveness and Positive Involvement scales.

Location. Results of the MANOVA, F (18, 1421), in Table 10 reveal that there are significant overall differences in the perception of fathers' and mothers' behavior between urban and rural adolescents (F = 2.87, p < .001, F = 3.20, p < .001, respectively). For fathers, the univariate analysis tests, F (1, 1438), for each scale show significant results (p < .001 to .05) in the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Rejection, Hostile Control, Acceptance of Individuation, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, and Hostile Detachment. The means of fathers of urban adolescents are significantly higher than are those of rural adolescents on the Acceptance, Child Centeredness, and Acceptance of Individuation scales. For mothers, the univariate analysis tests, F (1, 1438), for each scale show significant results (p < .01 to .05) in the following scales: Intrusiveness, Control Through Guilt, Hostile Control, Nonenforcement, and Acceptance of Individuation. The mean of mothers of urban adolescents is significantly higher than is that of the mothers of rural adolescents on the Acceptance of Individuation scale.

Family size. Results of the MANOVA, F (36, 2840), in Table 11 indicate that there are significant overall differences in the perception of fathers' and mothers' behavior among adolescents from one-child, small, and large families (F = 1.51, p < .05, F = 2.01, p < .001,

Table 10

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Location

	Fathers						Mothers					
	Location						Location					
	Urban[a]		Rural[b]		Multi-variate	Uni-variate	Urban		Rural		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	22.81	4.94	22.06	4.99	2.87***	8.37**	23.73	4.20	23.80	4.16	3.20***	.11
Child centeredness	23.04	5.09	22.16	5.29		10.35***	23.86	4.53	23.67	4.50		.59
Possessiveness	21.39	4.71	21.25	4.74		.34	22.36	3.95	22.43	4.03		.12
Rejection	13.76	3.81	14.48	4.19		11.76***	13.65	3.45	13.93	3.60		2.29
Control	18.60	4.26	18.90	4.28		1.71	19.19	3.89	19.37	3.89		.80
Enforcement	15.50	3.93	15.84	4.00		2.58	15.77	3.60	15.90	3.41		.48
Positive involvement	20.63	4.77	20.41	4.73		.81	21.42	4.23	21.50	4.17		.12
Intrusiveness	19.37	5.26	19.78	5.21		2.25	19.88	4.65	20.43	4.50		5.26*
Control through guilt	20.74	5.00	20.97	4.85		.81	22.20	4.30	22.74	4.32		5.67*
Hostile control	17.78	3.99	18.20	3.82		4.07*	18.52	3.69	19.06	3.57		7.96**
Inconsistent discipline	14.36	3.90	14.58	3.87		1.18	14.25	3.78	14.16	3.49		.21
Nonenforcement	14.96	3.84	15.16	3.92		.90	14.21	3.23	14.55	3.38		3.85*
Acceptance of individuation	22.47	4.17	21.53	4.30		17.75***	22.62	4.02	22.07	3.86		6.80**
Lax discipline	16.47	3.76	16.33	3.67		.57	16.09	3.44	16.09	3.44		.00
Instilling persistent anxiety	16.83	4.30	17.35	4.32		5.40*	17.64	4.39	17.87	4.06		1.07
Hostile detachment	14.84	3.83	15.45	3.98		8.98**	14.15	3.38	14.36	3.41		1.40
Withdrawal of relations	13.78	4.45	14.18	4.52		2.75	14.28	4.35	14.14	4.24		.38
Extreme autonomy	15.98	4.25	16.13	4.61		.41	15.41	3.75	15.72	4.21		2.19

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

[a] $n = 720$. [b] $n = 720$

Table 11

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Family Size

	Fathers							
	Family size							
	1 child[a]		Small[b]		Large[c]		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	23.28	5.23	22.64	4.94	21.91	4.97	1.51*	4.60**
Child centeredness	23.72	5.10	22.71	5.28	22.20	5.07		3.59*
Possessiveness	22.73	4.58	21.44	4.76	20.87	4.63		6.30**
Rejection	13.69	4.01	14.04	3.97	14.35	4.11		1.44
Control	19.76	4.27	18.75	4.27	18.57	4.26		2.83
Enforcement	16.28	4.51	15.65	3.88	15.60	4.03		1.11
Positive involvement	21.44	4.61	20.76	4.84	19.92	4.54		6.67***
Intrusiveness	21.39	5.13	19.39	5.31	19.58	5.07		5.66**
Control through guilt	21.91	4.31	20.85	4.97	20.67	4.93		2.29
Hostile control	18.21	3.77	18.02	3.92	17.90	3.92		.27
Inconsistent discipline	14.26	4.26	14.50	3.81	14.46	3.97		.15
Nonenforcement	14.75	3.66	15.00	3.91	15.23	3.87		.80
Acceptance of individuation	22.96	4.71	22.22	4.17	21.43	4.29		7.62***
Lax discipline	16.24	3.81	16.45	3.81	16.33	3.53		.24
Instilling persistent anxiety	17.58	4.33	17.07	4.38	17.05	4.19		.58
Hostile detachment	15.19	4.34	15.02	3.95	15.35	3.76		1.09
Withdrawal of relations	14.07	4.38	13.82	4.51	14.25	4.46		1.43
Extreme autonomy	15.20	4.65	16.14	4.36	16.07	4.52		1.73

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

[a] $n = 85$. [b] $n = 875$. [c] $n = 480$.

Table 11 (Continued)

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Family Size

	Mothers							
	Family size							
	1 child[a]		Small[b]		Large[c]		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	24.16	4.55	24.00	4.06	23.25	4.29	2.01***	5.46**
Child centeredness	24.80	4.56	24.00	4.43	23.14	4.60		8.11***
Possessiveness	23.48	4.06	22.57	3.86	21.89	4.15		7.97***
Rejection	13.81	3.62	13.59	3.27	14.16	3.92		4.03*
Control	19.88	4.06	19.31	3.83	19.11	3.96		1.47
Enforcement	16.49	4.11	15.80	3.44	15.78	3.50		1.61
Positive involvement	22.28	4.44	21.70	4.06	20.89	4.34		7.55***
Intrusiveness	21.25	4.89	20.14	4.68	19.97	4.32		2.81
Control through guilt	23.69	4.47	22.48	4.34	22.23	4.22		4.18*
Hostile control	19.59	3.84	18.77	3.62	18.67	3.64		2.33
Inconsistent discipline	13.88	3.56	14.21	3.62	14.26	3.68		.39
Nonenforcement	14.12	3.39	14.23	3.25	14.70	3.39		3.38*
Acceptance of individuation	23.29	4.20	22.60	3.80	21.71	4.08		10.55***
Lax discipline	15.62	3.21	15.92	3.43	16.48	3.47		5.08**
Instilling persistent anxiety	17.95	4.26	17.68	4.23	17.85	4.24		.35
Hostile detachment	13.93	3.68	14.12	3.17	14.57	3.72		3.12
Withdrawal of relations	14.49	4.89	14.10	4.21	14.36	4.35		.74
Extreme autonomy	15.36	4.30	15.46	3.87	15.78	4.14		1.14

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

[a]$n = 85$. [b]$n = 875$. [c]$n = 480$.

respectively). Univariate analysis tests, F (2, 1437), applied to the father scales yield significant F-scores ($p < .001$ to .05) for the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Positive Involvement, Intrusiveness, and Acceptance of Individuation. For mothers, the univariate analysis tests, F (2, 1437), for each scale yield significant F-scores ($p < .001$ to .05) for the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Rejection, Positive Involvement, Control Through Guilt, Nonenforcement, Acceptance of Individuation, and Lax Discipline. Pair-wise between-group comparisons (Scheffe) were conducted to determine the direction of family-size differences. The working alpha was set at .05. The significant differences for scale scores found in multiple comparisons between family sizes are displayed in Table 12.

Results from post hoc Scheffe comparisons ($p < .05$) show that means of fathers of adolescents from one-child families and small families are significantly greater than are those of fathers of adolescents from large families on the following scales: Positive Involvement and Acceptance of Individuation. Means of fathers of adolescents from one-child families are also significantly higher than are those of fathers of adolescents from large families on the Child Centeredness, Intrusiveness, and Possessiveness scales. The mean of fathers of adolescents from small families is higher than is the mean of fathers of adolescents from large

Table 12

Multiple Comparisons by Family Size for Table 11

Scale	Father	Mother
Acceptance	2>3[a]	2>3
Child centeredness	1>3	1>3, 2>3
Possessiveness	1>3	1>3, 2>3
Rejection	--	3>2
Control	--	--
Enforcement	--	--
Positive involvement	1>3, 2>3	1>3, 2>3
Intrusiveness	1>2, 1>3	--
Control through guilt	--	1>2, 1>3
Hostile control	--	--
Inconsistent discipline	--	--
Nonenforcement	--	3>2
Acceptance of individuation	1>3, 2>3	1>3, 2>3
Lax discipline	--	3>2
Instilling persistent anxiety	--	--
Hostile detachment	--	--
Withdrawal of relations	--	--
Extreme autonomy	--	--

[a] 1 = One-child family, 2 = Small family, 3 = Large family

families on the Acceptance scale. The mean of fathers of adolescents from one-child families is significantly higher than is the mean of fathers of adolescents from small families on the Intrusiveness scale.

Means of mothers of adolescents from one-child families and small families are significantly higher than are those of mothers of adolescents from large families on the Child Centeredness, Possessiveness, Positive Involvement, and Acceptance of Individuation scales. The mean of mothers of adolescents from small families is significantly higher than is the mean of mothers of adolescents from large families on the Acceptance scale. Means of mothers of adolescents from large families are significantly higher than are those of mothers of adolescents from small families on the following scales: Rejection, Nonenforcement, and Lax Discipline. The mean of mothers of adolescents from one-child families is significantly higher than is the mean of mothers of adolescents from small and large families on the Control Through Guilt scale.

Socio-economic status (SES). Results of the MANOVA, F (18, 1421) in Table 13 indicate that there are significant overall differences in the perception of fathers' and mothers' behavior between lower- and higher-SES adolescents ($F = 3.92$, $p < .001$, $F = 3.84$, $p < .001$, respectively). For fathers, the univariate analysis tests, F (1, 1438), for each scale show significant results ($p < .001$ to $.05$) in the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Rejection, Intrusiveness, Hostile Control, Acceptance of Individuation, Lax Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, Hostile Detachment, and Withdrawal of Relations. The means of fathers of higher-SES adolescents are higher

Table 13

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to SES

	Fathers						Mothers					
	SES						SES					
	Low[a]		High[b]		Multi-variate	Uni-variate	Low		High		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	22.16	4.97	23.01	4.95	3.92***	9.03**	23.69	4.20	23.93	4.13	3.84***	1.03
Child centeredness	22.29	5.21	23.26	5.15		11.08***	23.63	4.54	24.04	4.46		2.53
Possessiveness	21.34	4.73	21.29	4.73		.03	22.47	3.93	22.23	4.11		1.14
Rejection	14.26	4.06	13.81	3.92		3.90*	13.89	3.63	13.58	3.29		2.51
Control	18.81	4.23	18.61	4.36		.68	19.31	3.89	19.21	3.89		.24
Enforcement	15.76	4.07	15.48	3.76		1.59	15.89	3.47	15.72	3.58		.67
Positive involvement	20.37	4.77	20.84	4.69		3.16	21.42	4.19	21.54	4.21		.26
Intrusiveness	19.79	5.17	19.12	5.35		5.19*	20.35	4.48	19.73	4.77		5.85*
Control through guilt	20.96	4.98	20.64	4.82		1.31	22.68	4.32	22.02	4.31		7.38**
Hostile control	18.14	3.81	17.68	4.10		4.34*	18.91	3.56	18.53	3.79		3.41
Inconsistent discipline	14.60	3.89	14.20	3.88		3.26	14.22	3.61	14.17	3.69		.06
Nonenforcement	15.09	3.89	15.00	3.87		.19	14.41	3.34	14.32	3.24		.24
Acceptance of individuation	21.62	4.33	22.82	4.00		25.17***	22.02	3.88	23.02	4.01		20.08***
Lax discipline	16.22	3.73	16.77	3.67		6.69**	16.03	3.47	16.20	3.36		.77
Instilling persistent anxiety	17.27	4.36	16.70	4.20		5.63*	17.75	4.16	17.78	4.38		.02
Hostile detachment	15.30	3.87	14.80	4.00		5.17*	14.31	3.41	14.14	3.36		.84
Withdrawal of relations	14.17	4.52	13.57	4.39		5.76*	14.16	4.27	14.32	4.35		.44
Extreme autonomy	15.98	4.54	16.23	4.20		1.07	15.58	4.12	15.53	3.69		.05

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

$^a n = 978$. $^b n = 462$.

than those of lower-SES adolescents on the Acceptance, Child Centeredness, and Acceptance of Individuation scales. For mothers, the univariate analysis tests, F (1, 1438), of each scale show significant results (p < .001 to .05) in the following scales: Intrusiveness, Control Through Guilt, and Acceptance of Individuation. The mean of mothers of higher-SES adolescents is higher than is that of mothers of lower-SES adolescents on the Acceptance of Individuation scale.

Level of "kreng-chai." Results of the MANOVA, F (18, 701), in Table 14 indicate that there are significant overall differences in the perception of fathers' and mothers' behavior between adolescents with low and high kreng-chai (F = 1.89, p < .05, F = 2.64, p < .001, respectively). Univariate analysis tests, F (1, 718), applied to the father scales yield significant F-scores (p < .001 to .05) for the following scales: Acceptance, Rejection, Enforcement, Hostile Control, Inconsistent Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, Hostile Detachment, and Withdrawal of Relations. The mean of fathers of adolescents with a high level of kreng-chai is higher than is that of fathers of adolescents with a low level of kreng-chai in the Acceptance scale. For mothers, the univariate analysis tests, F (1, 718), of each scale show significant results (p < .001 to .05) in the following scales: Acceptance, Child Centeredness, Rejection, Inconsistent Discipline, Lax Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, Hostile Detachment, Withdrawal of

Table 14

MANOVA Table of Perception of Fathers and Mothers According to Level of "Kreng-Chai"

	Fathers						Mothers					
	Level of kreng-chai						Level of kreng-chai					
	Low[a]		High[b]		Multi-variate	Uni-variate	Low		High		Multi-variate	Uni-variate
Scale	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s	F	F
Acceptance	21.98	5.29	22.81	4.80	1.89*	4.86*	23.41	4.20	24.17	4.01	2.64***	6.29*
Child centeredness	22.27	5.31	22.98	4.98		3.44	23.59	4.41	24.29	4.32		4.55*
Possessiveness	21.16	4.71	21.37	4.67		.36	22.36	3.90	22.56	3.68		.50
Rejection	14.68	4.02	13.77	3.92		9.35**	14.22	3.40	13.31	3.22		13.81***
Control	18.77	4.27	18.78	4.37		.00	19.18	3.85	19.34	4.11		.32
Enforcement	15.88	3.84	15.26	4.01		4.60*	15.79	3.43	15.73	3.60		.04
Positive involvement	20.30	4.89	20.77	4.84		1.65	21.37	4.15	21.70	4.21		1.15
Intrusiveness	19.94	5.13	19.49	5.40		1.31	20.22	4.53	20.27	4.66		.02
Control through guilt	20.83	4.84	20.77	4.98		.03	22.22	4.35	22.64	4.29		1.76
Hostile control	18.43	3.96	17.73	3.77		5.92*	19.13	3.70	18.68	3.64		2.72
Inconsistent discipline	15.02	4.00	14.14	3.89		8.91**	14.67	3.67	13.87	3.53		9.00**
Nonenforcement	15.55	4.02	15.06	4.19		2.61	14.65	3.35	14.27	3.37		2.28
Acceptance of individuation	21.86	4.30	21.88	4.22		.00	22.48	3.82	22.37	3.86		.13
Lax discipline	16.83	3.91	16.39	3.86		2.30	16.64	3.51	15.79	3.46		10.70***
Instilling persistent anxiety	17.69	4.54	16.66	4.28		9.88**	18.16	4.40	17.27	4.15		7.77**
Hostile detachment	15.75	3.85	14.76	4.05		11.45***	14.56	3.18	13.95	3.42		6.16*
Withdrawal of relations	14.70	4.60	13.33	4.25		17.25***	14.63	4.24	13.62	4.05		10.82***
Extreme autonomy	16.41	4.60	15.78	4.43		3.54	16.09	4.10	15.17	3.99		9.37**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

[a] $n = 360$. [b] $n = 360$.

Relations, and Extreme Autonomy. The means of mothers of adolescents with a high level of _kreng-chai_ are higher than are those of mothers of adolescents with a low level of _kreng-chai_ in the Acceptance and Child Centeredness scales.

Normative Data for the Thai CRPBI-108. Normative data were collected from 1,440 Thai high school students. Male and female scores were also tabulated separately. The means of factor scores, standard deviations, and the percentile scores derived from the normative group are given in Tables 15 to 17.

Tables 16 and 17 display factor scores ranging from 13 to 29 for the dimension of Acceptance versus Rejection, from 11 to 25 for the dimension of Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, and from 15 to 27 for the dimension of Firm Control versus Lax Control.

This chapter has provided the results of the study. In the following chapter the results and their implications are discussed, and suggestions are made for future research.

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-108 Factors Based on 1,440 Thai Students

	Total (n=1,440)		Males (n=720)		Female (n=720)	
	x	s	x	s	x	s
Father						
Acc./Rej.[a]	22.80	3.64	22.57	3.45	23.04	3.80
PC/PA	17.33	3.01	17.44	2.92	17.20	3.09
FC/LC	21.38	2.65	21.41	2.59	21.35	2.71
Mother						
Acc./Rej.	23.67	3.05	23.57	2.89	23.77	3.20
PC/PA	17.93	2.74	17.93	2.69	17.93	2.79
FC/LC	21.82	2.42	21.67	2.44	21.97	2.39

[a] CRPBI-108 factors: Acc./Rej. = Acceptance vs. Rejection, PC/PA = Psychological Control vs. Psychological Autonomy, and FC/LC = Firm Control vs. Lax Control.

Table 16

Percentile Scores Based on 1,440 Thai Students

Subtotal score	Acc./Rej.		PC/PA		FC/LC	
	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
11	0	0	1	0	0	0
13	2	1	8	3	0	0
15	4	3	29	19	2	1
17	9	4	54	46	6	4
19	17	9	78	74	21	14
21	31	18	90	88	50	41
23	52	40	97	96	77	75
25	74	71	99	99	93	93
27	92	93			98	99
29	99	99				

Table 17

Percentile Scores Based on 1,440 Thai Students Broken Down by Sex

	Factors											
	Acc./Rej.				PC/PA				FC/LC			
	Father		Mother		Father		Mother		Father		Mother	
Subtotal score	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
11	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	1	2	0	1	7	9	3	3	0	0	0	0
15	3	4	2	3	26	31	19	19	1	2	1	1
17	8	10	4	5	52	57	46	46	6	7	4	3
19	17	17	8	9	76	79	74	74	21	22	16	13
21	33	28	19	17	90	90	89	87	50	50	44	39
23	58	47	42	37	97	96	97	95	77	78	76	74
25	79	70	75	67	99	98	99	99	93	93	94	91
27	93	91	93	92					98	98	99	99
29	99	99	99	99								

Chapter 5

Discussion and Implications

This chapter is composed of three sections: discussion, implications, and suggestions for future research.

Discussion

Factor Structure of CRPBI-108

The factor analyses conducted in this study support a three-factor model of parental behavior: Acceptance versus Rejection, Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy, and Firm Control versus Lax Control. Factor analyses of male and female adolescents' responses produce a factor structure very similar among themselves and also resemble those of related studies in the literature mentioned earlier in this study.

It was found that the first factor, Acceptance versus Rejection, accounts for more common variance than the other two. This study supports previous studies in that the most important dimension of parental behavior is Acceptance versus Rejection (Cross, 1969; Raskin et al., 1971). The third factor, described by positive loadings on the scales Nonenforcement, Lax Discipline, and Extreme Autonomy, reflects one pole of an earlier-identified bipolar factor, i.e., Firm Control versus Lax Control. This finding was similar to the finding of Raskin et al. The two scales, Control and Enforcement, both had significant loadings on Psychological Control versus Psychological Autonomy and reflect the overlap among the second and third factors. This relationship can be explained by the tendency of Thai parents to exercise indirect control techniques with explicit rules.

The results of this study replicate the range of application of the previously described factorial structure of the CRPBI. The findings also support Schludermann and Schludermann's (1971) conclusion. They stated that the modified version of the CRPBI could provide comparative information when it was employed to study adolescents from different backgrounds.

Sex of Parents

The results of the study appear to be consistent with Thai sex-role stereotypes, as the mothers were perceived as more involved and affectionate, whereas the fathers, in contrast, were reported as less affectionate and more distant. Bhongbhibhat (1982) maintained that "the main duty of Thai women . . . is to care for and bring up their children, a duty of far greater importance than their daily status as housewives" (p. 20). Since Thai mothers play the major role in child rearing, they may exert more influence on their children. They therefore were also reported to be more controlling (including controlling through guilt and hostility), intrusive, and persistent in instilling anxiety.

The results of the study are similar to those of the previous studies (i.e., Kroger, 1973; Raskin et al., 1971; Schaefer, 1968). For example, Schaefer found that mothers were reported as more nurturing and more controlling through covert methods than were fathers. Raskin et al. also found that mothers of both normal adults and depressed patients made greater use than did fathers of negative control techniques, especially "control through guilt." Becker (1964) reviewed many studies suggesting that mothers exercised more psychological control than did fathers.

Demographic and Other Variables

Sex of subjects. The findings of the study confirm previous results of small differences in the way males and females perceive their mothers (Crase et al., 1981; Cross, 1969; Kawash, 1985; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1983). The findings support earlier findings that females perceived their parents as more accepting than did males (Fristad & Karpowitz, 1988; Kroger, 1983; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1971, 1983). The results of the study reflect the relationship between girls and their parents in the Thai culture. A girl is normally more closely bound to her parents than is a boy.

The study reveals differences in the ways fathers and mothers treated male and female adolescents. Male adolescents rated their fathers significantly higher on Enforcement, Hostile Control, Inconsistent Discipline, Instilling Persistent Anxiety, and Extreme Autonomy. Fathers were found to treat male adolescents more negatively than did mothers, reflecting the relationship between male adolescents and their mothers and fathers. As mentioned earlier, the bond between a Thai mother and son is usually warmer than that between father and son. A son is raised to be like a "mother's boy" in his adulthood or to complement his mother. However, fathers may often try to dominate their sons.

The findings also indicate that male adolescents perceived both parents as more extreme in autonomy than did female adolescents. This might be due to the fact that in Thai society girls are raised to be more submissive towards their parents than are boys. Thai culture tends to place greater restrictions on girls' activities outside the home than on boys'.

Grade level. The perception of fathers' and mothers' behavior by adolescents varied with the adolescents' grade levels. The results indicate that adolescents in lower grades reported their parents as more accepting, child centered, possessive, positively involved, less rejecting, and less detached in a hostile manner than did the adolescents in higher grades. The results support the previous findings of Fristad and Karpowitz (1988), Goldin (1969), and Litovsky and Dusek (1985). The earlier researchers found that children in higher grades tended to report less acceptance from their parents.

It is interesting to note that adolescents in higher grades, especially those in Grades 11 to 12, perceived their parents as being more lax in discipline, nonenforcing, and extreme in autonomy than did adolescents in lower grades. These results imply that although parents stress obedience and interdependent relations with their children, they sometimes allow greater independence at certain ages (e.g., late adolescence).

It appears that older adolescents are expected to become more independent of parental control. Therefore, the problem that Thai parents may face is "how to facilitate their children's gradual acquisition of autonomy and independence while still maintaining restraints and limitations necessitated by the adolescent's inexperience or immature behaviors" (McKenry, Price-Bonham, & O'Bryant, 1981, p. 328). Too much autonomy may be interpreted as rejection. Mitchell (1979) noted that "the adolescent battle cry for independence is really only a plea for less restriction, not a cry for true independence" (p. 102).

Location. Interesting results emerge from this study suggesting that rural adolescents perceived their parents as less accepting of individuation than did urban adolescents. Rural adolescents also reported their fathers as being less accepting, less child centered, and more hostilely detached. One possible explanation of why rural adolescents perceived their parents as less accepting is that Thai parents in rural areas are not accustomed to expressing affection to their children. Amornvivat et al. (1991) noted that "love and acceptance are often expressed through use of negative words with opposite meaning intended" (p. 157). Basically, the parents' silence or indifference (choei) is a form of acceptance. Moreover, praise is not a form of acceptance in rural family life. Rural Thai parents still believe that praise is not good for children because it will make them conceited and potentially disobedient. With the influences of attending schools, the diffusion of urban society, and mass communication, rural adolescents might observe different forms of acceptance which are more explicit. They might, therefore, have interpreted their parents' indifference as being less accepting. The results imply that rural parents should readjust their child-rearing practices and should also display more explicit affection or care. Adolescents may be more accepting of parents who try to listen to their ideas and let them make some family decisions.

In contrast to rural adolescents, urban adolescents tended to perceive their parents as more accepting. This may be due to the fact that urban parents use more verbal praise, talk more with their children, and give them more freedom and choice in decision making. Urban parents may treat their children as their children prefer.

The results also suggest that rural parents tended to use more psychological discipline than did urban parents. One possible reason might be that rural Thai culture values obedience, humbleness, faithfulness, and respect of elders more than does urban Thai culture. Rural parents, therefore, tend to use more psychological control techniques to achieve greater conformity and compliance by their children to these values.

Caution must be taken in interpreting findings of perception of parental behavior among rural and urban adolescents. Parents in rural areas are probably poorer than are parents in urban areas. Therefore, the differences in perceived parental behavior between rural and urban adolescents may be attributable to socio-economic status rather than to location.

Family size. The results of the study indicate that adolescents in one-child or small families tended to perceive their parents as more child centered, possessive, positively involved, and accepting of individuation than did adolescents in large families. Adolescents from small families also reported their mothers as being more accepting. The results of the study appear to confirm the remarks made by Triandis (1977). He stated that the greater the number of children, the less acceptance parents display. The results also indicate that adolescents from one-child or small families tended to report more parental discipline than did adolescents from large families, who tended to perceive their parents as being more lax in discipline. Parker (1983) found that only-children perceived their parents as somewhat more protective than did children from larger families.

Since parents of large families have more children to take care of and cannot share as much time with each child, adolescents from large families might perceive their parents as less involved in their lives than would adolescents from small families.

Socio-economic status (SES). Some SES differences were apparent in the perception of fathers. Higher-SES adolescents found their parents to be more accepting, and more accepting of individuation. Higher-SES adolescents also perceived their fathers to be more child centered and lax in discipline. Lower-SES adolescents, however, found their parents to be more intrusive. Lower-SES adolescents reported their fathers to be more rejecting, hostilely controlling, persistent in instilling anxiety, hostilely detached, and withdrawing in relations. One plausible cause that can explain why lower-SES parents showed more rejection is economic pressure. Many of the lower-SES parents did not spend much time with their children and raised them with more emotion than reason.

These results are consistent with the findings of several researchers. Bhanthumnavin and Prachonpachanuk (1981), studying Thai adolescents, found that adolescents from high- and middle-SES families perceived their parents to be more love and reason oriented than did those from lower-SES families. Suvannathat (1981) found that lower-class families used more control than did the middle-class families. The children from middle-class families were also found to receive more attention from their mothers than did those from lower-class families. In other cultures, Schludermann and Schludermann (1983) found that Asian-Indian adolescents of lower SES reported more parental psychological control than did those of higher SES. Kroger (1983) also found that higher-SES fathers were perceived as being more positively involved with daughters than were fathers of lower SES. In addition, Rohner and Rohner (1983) found that Korean-American children of working-class parents perceived their mothers as more hostile, neglecting, and rejecting than did children of middle-class parents.

In essence, higher-SES adolescents tended to be more positively treated than were lower-SES adolescents. Parents in the higher-SES families are generally better able to sustain the Thai value placed on the role of parents.

"_Kreng-chai_." The results of the study suggest that adolescents with a high level of _kreng-chai_ described their parents as being more accepting, whereas adolescents with a low level of _kreng-chai_ described their parents as being more rejecting, enforcing, inconsistent in discipline, persistent in instilling anxiety, hostilely detached, and withdrawing in relations.

It is interesting to note that adolescents perceived their parents' behavior on the basis of Thai cultural beliefs. In Thailand, parents stress obedience in their children and want their children to be humble and respectful to their elders. Thai people believe that the person who feels kreng-chai toward another has a proper attitude. Adolescents with high kreng-chai very often submit to societal norms and expectations. They know that parents are people to whom they should pay high respect and, therefore, perceive their parents in a positive manner. The results of the study may be interpreted in another way. When adolescents feel kreng-chai toward their parents by considering their parents' feelings and adjusting their behavior to give their parents peace of mind, they then develop good interfamily relationships. Since they generally have good relationships with their parents and are treated well by them, they tend to perceive their parents positively. Adolescents with a low level of kreng-chai may be less obedient than are adolescents with a high level of kreng-chai. They may be more direct in their mannerisms and therefore may be treated differently than those with a high level of kreng-chai are. They then tend to perceive their parents in a different way.

One interesting result is that female adolescents with a high level of kreng-chai perceived their mothers as being less extreme in autonomy than did the adolescents with a low level of kreng-chai. This may be due to the interpretation of autonomy. They might consider that autonomy or independence is not an important goal in socialization.

A number of interesting findings have emerged from the study. One final remark is that caution should be used in applying the generalizations of the findings to all Thai people.

Implications

The implications of this study are as follows:

1. For parents, the findings will enable them to be more competent and sensitive about how adolescents think and feel about them. They can be better prepared to respond to adolescents' needs.

2. Parents usually neglect the adolescent period. Recognition of the importance of parent-training programs which focus on effective skills for raising adolescents may have important implications for increasing education and training of parents.

3. The normative data for the CRPBI-108 will be available for Thai high school students. These normative data are suitable for research purposes in large-group study. However, because the reliabilities of some scales were rather low, the standard error for individual scores is high. The questionnaire, therefore, cannot be used for making the decision about individuals.

4. It becomes apparent that the CRPBI-108 offers a very useful dimensional framework within which to investigate parental child-rearing behavior as perceived by children. This framework, however, is not suitable when

children have to rate each item in the questionnaire for both father and mother, as well as additional measures. Schludermann and Schludermann (1988) have recently developed a version of the CRPBI consisting of 30 items. For each dimension, the 10 items which had the highest correlations with a given dimension were selected. For practical implications, the shortened version of the Thai CRPBI should be developed in the future.

Suggestions for Future Research

The following recommendations are suggested for future studies:

1. The present study and results need to be replicated with other populations; for example, elementary school students, university students, and adults. Perceived parental behavior may be found to vary with the subjects' age.

2. Convergent or divergent validity of the instrument could be achieved with interview or observation data on parental behavior. It would be interesting to determine whether results obtained by using alternative measures would be different from the findings of the present study.

3. Since children from different backgrounds or socialization may have different perceptions of their parents, studies should be conducted comparing perceptions of parental behavior among different ethnic groups in Thailand.

4. It may be interesting to reverse the study to determine the impact of adolescent behaviors on the perception of parental behavior.

5. A future replication study should re-examine the quality of the translation of the Thai CRPBI-108.

6. There are other Thai concepts which pertain to the relational and reciprocal aspects of social behavior between individuals. These concepts play an integral role in understanding the Thai people and their culture. Two of these concepts, for example, are bun-kun (long-term obligation, indebted goodness) and katanyuu (gratefulness). In the future, research could be done to determine how these Thai concepts are related to or affect the perception of parents, especially in modern Thai society.

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Bell, S. M., & Stayton, D. J. (1972). Individual differences in the development of some attachment behaviors. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 18, 123-143.

Amornvivat, S., Khemmani, T., Thirachitra, V., & Kulapichitr, U. (1990). Thai ways of child rearing practices: An ethnographic study. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Printing House.

Amoroso, D. M., & Ware, E. E. (1986). Adolescents' perception of aspects of the home environment and their attitudes toward parents, self and external authority. Adolescence, 21(81), 191-204.

Anolik, S. A. (1980). The family perceptions of delinquents, high school students, and freshman college students. Adolescence, 15, 903-911.

Armentrout, J. A. (1971). Parental child-rearing attitudes and preadolescents' problem behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 37, 278-285.

Armentrout, J. A., & Burger, G. K. (1972a). Factor analyses of college students' recall of parental child-rearing behaviors. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 121, 155-161.

Armentrout, J. A., & Burger, G. K. (1972b). Children's reports of parental child-rearing behavior at five grade levels. Developmental Psychology, 7, 44-48.

Arrindell, W. A., Perris, C., Eisemann, M., Perris, H., van der Ende, J., Ross, M., & Benjaminsen, S. (1986). Cross-national generalizability of patterns of parental rearing behavior: Invariance of EMBU dimensional representations of healthy subjects from Australia, Denmark, Hungary, Italy and the Netherlands. Personality and Individual Differences, 7(1), 103-112.

Arrindell, W. A., Perris, C., Perris, H., Eisemann, M., van der Ende, J., & von Knorring, L. (1986). Cross-national invariance of dimensions of parental rearing behavior: Comparison of psychometric data of Swedish depressives and healthy subjects with Dutch target ratings on the EMBU. British Journal of Psychiatry, 148, 305-309.

Ausubel, D. P., Balthazar, E. E., Rosenthal, I., Blackman, L. S., Schpoont, S. H., & Welkowitz, J. (1954). Perceived parent attitudes as determinants of children's ego structure. Child Development, 25, 173-183.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monograph, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4, 1-103.

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38, 291-327.

Becker, W. C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1, pp. 169-208). New York: Russell Sage.

Becker, W. C., Krug, R. S. (1964). A circumplex model for social behavior in children. Child Development, 35, 371-396.

Bhanthumnavin, D., & Chareonying, B. (1974). The influences of society upon adolescents' attitudes. Bangkok: International Institute of Child Study.

Bhanthumnavin, D., & Prachonpachanuk, P. (1977). Morality in Thai youth. Bangkok: Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakarinwirot University.

Bhanthumnavin, D., & Prachonpachanuk, P. (1981). Parent-child relations, mental health and morality of Thai school adolescents. Bangkok: Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakarinwirot University.

Bhongbhibhat, V. (1982). The role of women in child care during the 200 years. In UNICEF East Asia and Pakistan Regional Office (Ed.), 200 years of child care in Thailand. Bangkok: Author.

Bhuapirom, L. (1985). Aggression and dominance. In C. Suvannathat, D. Bhanthumnavin, L. Bhuapirom, & D. M. Keats (Eds.), Handbook of Asian child development and child rearing practices (pp. 255-272). Bangkok: Behavioral Science Institute, Srinakarinvirot University.

Brislin, R. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1, 185-216.

Brislin, R. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. In H. C. Triandis & J. Draguns (Eds.), Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Methodology (pp. 389-444). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, S. E. (1984). Social class, child maltreatment, and delinquent behavior. Criminology, 22, 259-278.

Buaklee, P. (1971). A comparative study of anxiety, "kreng-chai" and creativity of the students outside and inside Bangkok and international school students. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Burger, G. K., & Armentrout, J. A. (1971). A factor analysis of fifth and sixth graders' reports of parental child-rearing behavior. Developmental Psychology, 4, 483.

Campbell, D. J. (1960). Recommendations for APA test standards regarding construct, trait, and discriminant validity. American Psychologist, 15, 546-553.

Chuchom, O., Phisalaphong, W., Sukharom, A., & Vanindananda, N. (1983). The relationship between child-rearing, school readiness and school achievement of Grade 1 students. Bangkok: Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakarinwirot University.

Coleman, J. D. (1974). Relationships in adolescence. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Cooper, R., & Cooper, N. (1990). Culture shock! Thailand and how to survive it (3rd ed.). Singapore: Times Books International.

Cox, S. H. (1970). Intrafamily comparisons of loving-rejecting child-rearing practices. Child Development, 41, 437-448.

Crase, S., Foss, C., & Colbert, K. (1981). Children's self-concept and perception of parents' behavior. Journal of Psychology, 108, 297-303.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16(3), 297-334.

Cross, H. J. (1969). College students' memories of their parents: A factor analysis of the CRPBI. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33(3), 275-278.

Duncan, D. F. (1978). Attitudes toward parents and delinquency in suburban adolescent males. Adolescence, 13, 365-369.

Forman, S., & Forman, B. (1981). Family environment and its relation to adolescent personality factors. Journal of Personality Assessment, 45, 163-167.

Francis, B. B. (1978). A study of the relationship between adolescents' perceptions of parental power, parental power legitimation, and adolescent-parent attitude congruence. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38(11-B), 5643-5644.

Fristad, M. A., & Karpowitz, D. H. (1988). Norms for the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory--Modified Form. Psychological Reports, 62(2), 665-666.

Fu, V. R., Goodwin, M. P., Sporakowski, M. J., & Hinkle, D. E. (1987). Children's thinking about family characteristics and parent attributes. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 148(2), 153-166.

Gecas, V. (1971). Parental behavior and dimensions of adolescent self-evaluation. Sociometry, 34(4), 466-482.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950). Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goldin, P. C. (1969). A review of children's reports of parent behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 71(3), 222-236.

Goldman, J. D., & Goldman, R. J. (1988). Children's perceptions of parents and their roles: A cross-national study in Australia, England, North America, and Sweden. Sex Roles, 9, 791-812.

Gordon, T. (1970). Parent effectiveness training. New York: Peter H. Wyden.

Gove, W. R., & Crutchfield, R. D. (1982). The family and juvenile delinquency. Sociological Quarterly, 23, 301-319.

Graybill, D. (1978). Relationship of maternal child-rearing behaviors to children's self-esteem. Journal of Psychology, 100, 45-47.

Grotevant, H. D., & Carlson, C. I. (1989). Family assessment. New York: Guilford Press.

Haque, A. (1987). Social class differences in perceived maternal acceptance-rejection and personality dispositions among Pakistani children. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Hazzard, A., Christensen, A., & Margolin, G. (1983). Children's perceptions of parental behavior. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 11, 49-59.

Hoffman, L. W. (1987). The value of children to parents and child rearing patterns. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Hoffman, L. W., & Lippitt, R. (1960). The measurement of family life variables. In P. H. Musser (Ed.), Handbook of research methods in child development. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Imperio, A. M., & Chabot, D. R. (1980). Male delinquents' perceptions of their parents: A factor analysis. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 51, 829-830.

Iyaruk, S. (1974). Honesty, self concept and "kreng-chai" of Buddhist and Muslim students in four southern border provinces, Thailand. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Jacob, T., & Tennenbaum, D. L. (1988). Family assessment. New York: Plenum.

Jensen, G. F. (1972). Parents, peers and delinquent action: A test of the differential association perspective. American Journal of Sociology, 78, 562-575.

Jotiban, N. (1985). Siblings' roles. In C. Suvannathat, D. Bhanthumnavin, L. Bhuapirom, & D. M. Keats (Eds.), Handbook of Asian child development and child rearing practices (pp. 301-313). Bangkok: Behavioral Science Institute, Srinakarinwirot University.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1984). Socialization in traditional society: A challenge to psychology. International Journal of Psychology, 19, 145-157.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1988). Diversity of socialization and social change. In P. R. Dasen, J. W. Berry, & N. Sartorius (Eds.), Health and cross-cultural psychology: Toward applications. London: Sage.

Kawash, G. F., & Clewes, J. L. (1988). A factor analysis of a short form of the CRPBI: Are children's perceptions of control and discipline multidimensional? Journal of Psychology, 122(1), 57-67.

Kawash, G. F., Kerr, E. N., & Clewes, J. L. (1985). Self-esteem in children as a function of perceived parental behavior. Journal of Psychology, 119(3), 235-242.

Kemp, J. H. (1982). Kinship and locality in Hua Kok. Journal of the Siam Society, 70, 1982.

Kitahara, M. (1987). Perception of parental acceptance and rejection among Swedish university students. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11(2), 223-227.

Klausner, W. J. (1987). Reflection on Thai culture. Bangkok: Amarin Printing Group.

Koedkietpong, T. (1960). Children's attitudes towards peers and parents. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Komin, S. (1985). The world view through Thai value system. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Komin, S. (1989). Social dimensions of industrialization in Thailand. Bangkok: Research Center, National Institute of Development Administration.

Komin, S. (1990). Psychology of the Thai people. Bangkok: Research Center, National Institute of Development Administration.

Kroger, J. (1983). University students' perceptions of their parents' child rearing behavior. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 18(2), 115-125.

Kroupa, S. E. (1988). Perceived parental acceptance and female juvenile delinquency. Adolescence, 23, 171-185.

Litovsky, V. G., & Dusek, J. B. (1985). Perceptions of child rearing and self-concept development during the early adolescent years. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14(5), 373-388.

Livesley, W. J., & Bromley, D. B. (1973). Person perception in childhood and adolescence. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Lloyd, S., & Chuchom, O. (1985). The role of mother in child development. In C. Suvannathat, D. Bhanthumnavin, L. Bhuapirom, & D. M. Keats (Eds.), Handbook of Asian child development and child rearing practices (pp. 277-300). Bangkok: Behavioral Science Institute, Srinakarinwirot University.

Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Heterington (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

Margolies, P. J., & Weintraub, S. (1977). The revised 56-item CRPBI as a research instrument: Reliability and factor structure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33(2), 472-477.

Martin, B. (1975). Parent-child relations. In F. D. Horowitz (Ed.), Review of child development research: Volume 4 (pp. 463-541). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCord, J. (1979). Some child-rearing antecedents of criminal behavior in adult men. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1477-1486.

McCord, J. (1983). A longitudinal study of aggression and antisocial behavior. In K. T. Van Dusen & S. A. Mednick (Eds.), Prospective studies of crime and delinquency. Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

McDonald, G. (1980). Parental power and adolescents' parental identification: A re-examination. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 289-296.

McKenry, P. C., Price-Bonham, S., & O'Bryant, L. O. (1981). Adolescent discipline: Different family members' perception. Journal of Youth and Adolescents, 10(5), 327-337.

Meijer, A. (1985). Female high school students' assessment of their parents. Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences, 22(8), 191-200.

Milton, G. A. (1958). A factor analytic study of child-rearing behaviors. Child Development, 29, 381-392.

Mitchell, J. J. (1979). Adolescent psychology. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart & Winston of Canada.

Mole, R. L. (1973). Thai values and behavior patterns. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Moore, F. J. (1974). Thailand: Its people, its society, its culture. New Haven: Hraf Press.

Muecke, M. A. (1983). Thai conjugal family relationships and the Hsu Hypothesis. Journal of the Siam Society, 71, 25-41.

Mulder, N. (1990). Inside Thai culture: An interpretation of everyday life (3rd ed.). Bangkok: Editions Duang Kamol.

Nakavachara, V., & Nathasiri, D. (1983). A study of adolescents' attitude towards social institutes. Bangkok: Somdej Chaopraya Hospital.

Neilsen, L. (1987). Adolescent psychology: A contemporary view. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Niles, F. S. (1979). The adolescent girls' perception of parent and peers. Adolescence, 14(55), 591-597.

Openshaw, D. K., Thomas, D. L., & Rollins, B. C. (1984). Parental influences of adolescent self-esteem. Journal of Early Adolescence, 4(3), 259-274.

Parker, G. (1983). Parental overprotection: A risk factor in psychosocial development. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. B. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 52, 1-10.

Patamanont, A. (1973). A comparative and correlational study of "kreng-chai" and socialization process between Thai-Buddhist and Thai-Muslim children. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Perris, C., Arrindell, W. A., Perris, H., van der Ende, J., Maj, M., Benjaminsen, S., Ross, M. Eisemann, M., & del Vecchio, M. (1985). Cross-national study of perceived parental rearing behavior in healthy subjects from Australia, Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden: Pattern and level comparisons. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavia, 72, 278-282.

Perris, C., Jacobsson, L., Lindstrom, H., van Knorring, L., & Perris, H. (1980). Development of a new inventory for assessing memories of parental rearing behavior. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavia, 61, 265-274.

Phillips, H. P. (1965). Thai peasant personality. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Phisalaphong, W., & Vanindananda, N. (1984). _A study of child-rearing practices, physical development and school readiness in preschool children_. Research Report No. 29. Bangkok: Behavioral Science Research Institute.

Potter, J. M. (1976). _Thai peasant social structure_. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Potter, J. M. (1977). _Family life in a northern Thai village: A study in the structural significance of women_. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Preewan, P. (1973). _A study of the relationship and the comparison of "kreng-chai," achievement motive and save-face between ethnic Thai and Chinese in Bangkok and in the provinces of the central part of Thailand_. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Pulkkinen, L. (1983). Search for alternatives to aggression in Finland. In A. P. Goldstein & M. Segall (Eds.), _Aggression in global perspective_. New York: Pergamon.

Racz, T. (1990). _Child's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory: Ethnic difference_. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta.

Raskin, A., Boothe, H. H., Reatig, N. A., Schulterbrandt, J. G., & Odle, D. (1971). Factor analyses of normal and depressed patients' memories of parental behavior. _Psychological Reports_, _29_, 871-879.

Renson, G. J., Schaefer, E. S., & Levy, B. I. (1968). Cross-national validity of a spherical conceptual model for parent behavior. _Child Development_, _39_, 1229-1235.

Rigby, K., & Rump, E. E. (1981). Attitudes toward parents and institutional authorities during adolescence. _The Journal of Psychology_, _109_, 109-118.

Rohner, E. C. (1980). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and children's reported personality and behavioral dispositions. _Behavior Science Research_, _15_(1), 81-88.

Rohner, E. C., & Rohner, R. P. (1983). Socio-economic status and children's perceptions of maternal acceptance-rejection in Korean-American immigrant families. In J. B. Deregowski & S. Dziurawiec (Eds.), _Expiscations in cross-cultural psychology_. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger B.V.

Rohner, E. C., Rohner, R. P., & Roll, S. (1980). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and children's reported behavioral dispositions. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 11(2), 213-231.

Rohner, R. P. (1975). They love me, they love me not: A worldwide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection. New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files.

Rohner, R. P. (1980). Worldwide tests of parental acceptance-rejection theory: An overview. Behavior Science Research, 15, 1-23.

Rohner, R. P. (1986). The warmth dimension. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rohner, R. P., Hahn, B. C., & Rohner, E. C. (1980). Social class differences in perceived parental acceptance-rejection and self-evaluation among Korean-American children. Behavior Science Research, 15, 55-67.

Rohner, R. P., & Nielsen, C. C. (1978). Parental acceptance and rejection: A review and annotated bibliography of research and theory. New Haven, CT: HRAF.

Rohner, R. P., Roll, S., & Rohner, E. C. (1980). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and personality organization among Mexican and American elementary school children. Behavior Science Research, 15, 23-39.

Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1979). Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family (Vol. 1, pp. 317-364). New York: Free Press.

Saavedra, J. M. (1980). Effects of perceived parental warmth and control on the self-evaluation of Puerto Rican adolescent males. Behavior Science Research, 15, 41-54.

Salama, M. M. (1987). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and personality dispositions among college students in Egypt. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Sangsingkeo, P. (1969). Buddhism and some effects on the rearing of children in Thailand. In W. Candill & T. Lin (Eds.), Mental health research in Asia and the Pacific. Honolulu: East-West Center Press.

Schaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-235.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965a). Children's report of parental behavior: An inventory. Child Development, 36(2), 413-424.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965b). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29(6), 552-557.

Schludermann, E., & Schludermann, S. (1970a). Questionnaire for Teen-Agers and Young Adults. Unpublished manuscript.

Schludermann, E., & Schludermann, S. (1970b). Replicability of factors in Children's Report of Parent Behavior (CRPBI). Journal of Psychology, 76, 239-249.

Schludermann, E., & Schludermann, S. (1988). Questionnaire for Children and Youth (CRPBI-108). Unpublished manuscript.

Schludermann, S., & Schludermann, E. (1971). Adolescent perception of parent behavior (CRPBI) in Hutterite communal society. Journal of Psychology, 79, 29-39.

Schludermann, S., & Schludermann, E. (1983). Sociocultural change and adolescents' perceptions of parental behavior. Developmental Psychology, 19, 674.

Schwarz, J. C., Barton-Henry, M. L., & Pruzinsky, R. (1985). Assessing child-rearing behaviors: A comparison of ratings made by mother, father, child, and sibling on the CRPBI. Child Development, 56, 462.

Sharp, L. (1963). Thai (Siamese) social structure. Proceedings of the ninth Pacific science congress on anthropology and social science, Bangkok, November, 1957.

Siegelman, M. (1965). Evaluation of Bronfenbrenner's questionnaire for children concerning parental behavior. Child Development, 36, 164-174.

Simons, R. L., & Robertson, J. F. (1989). The impact of parenting factors, deviant peers and coping style upon adolescent drug use. Family Relations, 38, 273-282.

Simons, R. L., Robertson, J. F., & Downs, W. R. (1989). The nature of the association between parental rejection and delinquent behavior. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 18(3), 297-310.

Sinha, D. (1988). The family scenario in a developing country and its implications for mental health. In P. R. Dasen, J. W. Berry, & N. Sartorius (Eds.), Health and cross-cultural psychology: Toward applications. London: Sage.

Smith, H. E. (1971). Thai-American intermarriage in Thailand. International Journal of Sociology and the Family, 1, 127-135.

Smith, H. E. (1973). The Thai family: Nuclear or extended. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35(1), 136-141.

Smuckarn, S. (1976a). Mee gnern koa nub waa nong, mee tong koa nub waa phii (Having money is seen as being younger, whereas having gold is seen as being older). Bangkok: Banakit Trading.

Smuckarn, S. (1976b). Family and kinship systems in Thailand. Bangkok: Fuangugsorn.

Smuckarn, S. (1988). Family system, kinship, and Thai politics. In Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University (Ed.), Sociocultural basis of Thai politics (pp. 193-255). Bangkok: Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University.

Srisuthisa-ard, K. (1973). A study of the relationship and the comparison of "kreng-chai," self-esteem, and achievement motive between ethnic Thai and Chinese in Bangkok and the southern provinces of Thailand. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Sritrakul, P. (1973). A study of the relationship and the comparison of "kreng-chai," gain face-lose face and achievement motive between the ethnic Thai and Chinese in Bangkok and the northeastern provinces of Thailand. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Starkey, S. L. (1980). The relationship between parental acceptance-rejection and the academic performance of fourth and fifth graders. Behavior Science Research, 15, 67-81.

Steinberg, L. (1990, August). Adolescent development in ecological perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston.

Stogdill, R. M. (1936). The measurement of attitudes toward parental control. Journal of Applied Psychology, 20, 359-367.

Straus, M. A. (1964a). Power and support structure of the family in relation to socialization. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 318-326.

Straus, M. A. (1964b). Measuring families. In H. T. Christiansen (Ed.), Handbook of marriage and the family (pp. 335-402). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Subsomboon, J. (1973). A comparative and correlative study of "kreng-chai" and socialization process between Thai Buddhist children and Thai Christian children. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Suphaap, S. (1988). Thai society and culture: Value, family, religion and custom. Bangkok: Thai Wattanapanit.

Suvannathat, C. (1981). Changing pattern of child-rearing practices in urban low income families. Bangkok: Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakarinwirot University.

Suvannathat, C., Kasemnet, L., Seedonrasmee, W., & Lloyd, S. (1986). Intergenerational conflicts regarding child rearing practices and its effect on certain behavior of children. Bangkok: Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakarinwirot University.

Symonds, P. M. (1938). A study of parental acceptance and rejection. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 8, 679-688.

Symonds, P. M. (1939). The psychology of parent-child relationships. New York: Appleton-Century.

Tangkapipop, N. (1973). The comparative study of personality, "kreng-chai," and creativity of Thai adolescents from Thai and Chinese families. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Theerasasawat, S., & Srisontisuk, S. (1986). The economic, political, social and cultural changes in Esan villages: A case study of Nontabag village. Khon Kaen: Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, Khon Kaen University.

Thomas, D. L., Weigert, A. J., & Winston, N. (1984). Adolescent identification with father and mother: A multi-national study. Acta Paedologica, 1(1), 67-68.

Triandis, H. C. (1977). Cross-cultural social and personality psychology. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 143-158.

Trommsdorff, G. (1984). Some comparative aspects of socialization in Japan and Germany. In I. Reyes-Lagunes & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), From a different perspective: Studies of behavior across cultures. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

UNICEF East Asia and Pakistan Regional Office. (1982). 200 years of child care in Thailand. Bangkok: Author.

Wachirasukmongkol, B. (1973). A study of the relationship and the comparison of "kreng-chai," self-esteem, and achievement motive between the ethnic Thai and Chinese in Bangkok and the northern provinces of Thailand. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Wichiarajote, W. (no date). A study of Thai "kreng-chai." Bangkok: Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Wichiencharoen, A. (1976). Social values in Thailand. Journal of Social Science Review, 1(1), 122-170.

Williams, D. L. (1983). Thai ways and my ways. Unpublished manuscript. The Educational Resources Information Center.

Winch, R. F., & Gordon, M. T. (1973). Familial structure and function as influence. Mass: Lexington Book.

Wipawin, T. (1973). A comparative and correlational study of the socialization process and "kreng-chai" between students from Thai and Chinese families. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Withayawongruchi, K. (1983). The relationship between family relations and adjustment. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Srinakarinwirot University, Prasarnmitr.

Wright, D. S. (1962). A comparative study of the adolescent's concepts of his parents and teachers. Educational Review, 14(3), 226-233.

Zuckerman, M., Ribback, B. B., Monashkin, I., & Norton, J. A. (1958). Normative data and factor analysis on the PART. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22(3), 165-161.

Appendix A

Normative Data for the CRPBI-108

(Based on Schludermann and Schludermann's [1970a] data)

Appendix A

Normative Data for the CRPBI-108

Table A-1

Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-108 Factors Based on 364 High School Students

	Father		Mother	
Factors	*X*	*s*	*X*	*s*
Acc./Rej.	21.23	3.89	21.81	3.54
PC/PA	15.38	3.63	16.79	3.47
FC/LC	20.86	3.42	20.70	3.09

Table A-2

Percentile Scores Based on 364 High School Students

	Factors					
	Acc./Rej.		PC/PA		FC/LC	
Subtotal score	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
11	0	0	9	2	0	0
13	4	2	38	18	2	0
15	9	5	58	43	6	3
17	18	12	74	62	14	13
19	30	25	84	80	31	34
21	48	41	92	90	57	61
23	70	63	95	95	77	81
25	85	84	99	98	89	91
27	96	98		99	97	98
29	99				99	99

Table A-3

Means and Standard Deviations of CRPBI-108 Factors Based on 1,192 University Students

	Factors					
	Acc./Rej.		PC/PA		FC/LC	
	X	*S*	*X*	*S*	*X*	*S*
Father						
Males	20.11	3.99	15.65	3.74	18.88	3.64
Females	21.43	4.43	14.90	3.50	19.38	3.70
Mother						
Males	22.07	3.29	16.11	3.74	17.96	3.34
Females	22.70	4.04	15.51	3.54	18.98	3.24

Table A-4

Percentile Scores Based on 1,192 University Students

	Factors											
	Acc./Rej.				PC/AC				FC/LC			
	Father		Mother		Father		Mother		Father		Mother	
Subtotal score	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
11	2	2	0	1	9	14	6	8	1	0	1	0
13	6	5	1	3	37	55	30	36	8	4	8	3
15	14	12	4	6	57	65	53	60	18	16	24	14
17	26	21	9	11	71	80	69	76	34	32	45	32
19	40	32	20	20	85	89	82	85	55	52	67	57
21	63	45	39	32	92	94	90	92	78	70	85	78
23	80	63	65	50	97	97	96	97	89	85	94	90
25	91	79	86	73	98	99	98	99	95	94	98	97
27	99	93	97	92	99		99		99	98	99	99
29		99	99							99		

Appendix B

Scale Reliability Coefficient: Cronbach's Alpha of the Thai CRPBI-108 (n = 200)

Appendix B

Scale Reliability Coefficient: Cronbach's Alpha of the Thai CRPBI-108 (n = 200)

Table B-1

Cronbach's Alpha of the Thai CRPBI-108

Scale	Reliability Coefficient	
	Father	Mother
1. Acceptance	.85	.82
2. Child centeredness	.80	.66
3. Possessiveness	.67	.48
4. Rejection	.72	.74
5. Control	.60	.48
6. Enforcement	.59	.54
7. Positive involvement	.80	.77
8. Intrusiveness	.74	.64
9. Control through guilt	.76	.62
10. Hostile control	.66	.67
11. Inconsistent discipline	.55	.53
12. Nonenforcement	.47	.53
13. Acceptance of individuation	.78	.69
14. Lax discipline	.47	.36
15. Instilling persistent anxiety	.61	.66
16. Hostile detachment	.66	.63
17. Withdrawal of relations	.78	.59
18. Extreme autonomy	.64	.56

Appendix C

CRPBI-108 Item-Scale Correlations (n = 200)

Appendix C

CRPBI-108 Item-Scale Correlations (n = 200)

Table C-1

CRPBI-108 Item-Scale Correlations

	Correlation		
Item	Father	Mother	Scale
1	.66	.64	Acceptance
14	.68	.61	
43	.68	.63	
50	.78	.73	
59	.66	.66	
76	.79	.76	
83	.69	.70	
96	.66	.62	
15	.73	.52	Child centeredness
31	.77	.68	
60	.76	.73	
84	.72	.66	
97	.74	.68	
36	.64	.48	Possessiveness
51	.64	.50	
65	.58	.52	
89	.74	.64	
103	.68	.69	
2	.53	.58	Rejection
23	.59	.47	
44	.62	.58	
52	.65	.67	
61	.64	.58	
71	.55	.54	
85	.60	.70	
104	.51	.62	

(table continues)

Table C-1 (continued)

CRPBI-108 Item-Scale Correlations

Item	Correlation Father	 Mother	Scale
3	.60	.49	Control
16	.61	.62	
32	.67	.63	
72	.56	.51	
98	.66	.59	
9	.65	.70	Enforcement
24	.69	.65	
37	.56	.47	
77	.59	.60	
105	.59	.54	
17	.67	.64	Positive involvement
38	.71	.60	
53	.64	.61	
66	.67	.64	
86	.62	.64	
90	.65	.61	
99	.50	.52	
106	.70	.68	
4	.72	.59	Intrusiveness
18	.74	.64	
33	.65	.61	
45	.69	.66	
73	.70	.70	
10	.67	.55	Control through guilt
39	.64	.55	
67	.74	.74	
78	.70	.62	
91	.80	.69	

(table continues)

Table C-1 (continued)

CRPBI-108 Item-Scale Correlations

	Correlation		
Item	Father	Mother	Scale
11	.52	.46	Hostile control
25	.52	.43	
34	.54	.57	
54	.62	.56	
74	.47	.46	
79	.59	.65	
92	.58	.63	
100	.50	.64	
5	.65	.61	Inconsistent discipline
19	.43	.47	
46	.70	.69	
62	.60	.57	
101	.58	.57	
12	.63	.58	Nonenforcement
26	.60	.53	
55	.55	.55	
68	.57	.63	
80	.48	.65	
20	.69	.60	Acceptance of individuation
27	.54	.54	
35	.67	.52	
40	.71	.55	
63	.60	.49	
69	.66	.64	
87	.47	.63	
93	.66	.57	
6	.58	.61	Lax discipline
21	.47	.45	
47	.53	.55	
75	.66	.56	
102	.61	.46	

(table continues)

Table C-1 (continued)

CRPBI-108 Item-Scale Correlations

Item	Correlation Father	 Mother	Scale
28	.63	.60	Instilling persistent anxiety
41	.64	.67	
56	.72	.73	
81	.46	.53	
107	.69	.70	
7	.69	.54	Hostile detachment
13	.63	.51	
29	.63	.61	
48	.55	.51	
57	.59	.52	
70	.45	.53	
82	.40	.54	
94	.40	.55	
8	.75	.67	Withdrawal of relations
22	.79	.68	
49	.55	.52	
64	.78	.56	
88	.74	.63	
30	.57	.54	Extreme Autonomy
42	.69	.63	
58	.68	.56	
95	.60	.54	
108	.66	.72	

Note. All $P < 0.001$.

Appendix D

Numbers of Subjects by Region, Province, School, and Grade

Table D-1

Numbers of Subjects by Region, Province, School, and Grade

	Number of students																		Total		
	Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade 9			Grade 10			Grade 11			Grade 12					
Region/Province/School	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Northeastern Region																					
Nakorn Ratchasima																					
1. Boonwattana	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Jakarat	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Nong Khai																					
1. Partoomtepwittayakan	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Buengkan	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Central Region																					
Chonburi																					
1. Chonburi "Sukhabot"	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Potisampanpittayakarn	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Saraburi																					
1. Saraburiwittayakom	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Saohai "Wimolwittayanukool"	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Northern Region																					
Lam Pang																					
1. Khelang Nakorn	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Koekaa	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Kamphaengphet																					
1. Kamphaengphet-wittayakom	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Sai-Ngam	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72

Table D-1 (Continued)
Numbers of Subjects by Region, Province, School, and Grade

	Number of students																		Total		
	Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade 9			Grade 10			Grade 11			Grade 12					
Region/Province/School	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	T	F	M	T	F
Southern Region																					
Pattani																					
1. Benjamarachutit	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Poekeereeratsuksa	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Krabi																					
1. Ammatpanichnukoon	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Awluekprachason	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Metropolitan																					
Bangkok																					
1. Nonseewittaya	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
2. Wat Rangbua	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
3. Wat Nongjock	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
4. Protepittayapayat	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	6	6	12	36	36	72
Total	120	120	240	120	120	240	120	120	240	120	120	240	120	120	240	120	120	240	720	720	1,440

Appendix E

Questionnaires

Appendix E-1

Questionnaires

This is a study of perceived parental behavior. There are two questionnaires for you to complete. Please complete these questionnaires from start to finish in order. This is not a test. All responses made in these questionnaires will be considered confidential; therefore, it is not necessary to put your name on the questionnaire.

Part I

Demographic Information

Please circle the letter of the response which applies to you or fill in the blank where appropriate.

1. How old are you?
   ____ years and
   ____ months

2. What is your sex?
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. In what grade are you?

a. 7	c. 9	e. 11
b. 8	d. 10	f. 12

4. How many brothers and sisters do you have?
   a. None
   b. One or two
   c. Three or more

5. How much money do your father and your mother earn monthly?
   a. Below 5,000 baht
   b. 5,000 - 10,000 baht
   c. More than 10,000 baht

6. What level of education did your father finish?
   a. Uneducated or primary school
   b. Secondary school or certificate in vocational training
   c. Higher certificate in vocational training or other certificate at the same level
   d. Bachelor's degree or above

7. What level of education did your mother finish?
   a. Uneducated or primary school
   b. Secondary school or certificate in vocational training
   c. Higher certificate in vocational training or other certificate at the same level
   d. Bachelor's degree or above

8. What is your father's occupation?

   a. Government official or public enterprise official (please specify his position and his job)

   ____

   b. Worker in a private agency (please specify his position and his job)

   ____

   c. Businessman or business owner (please explain the position or the business types in detail)

   ____

   d. Worker or unskilled worker (please explain the job in detail)

   ____

   e. Farmer (please explain his job in detail)

   ____

   f. Other (please specify)

   ____

9. What is your mother's occupation?

   a. Government official or public enterprise official (please specify her position and her job)

   ____

   b. Worker in a private agency (please specify her position and her job)

   ____

   c. Businesswoman or business owner (please explain the position or the business types in detail)

   ____

   d. Worker or unskilled worker (please explain the job in detail)

   ____

   e. Farmer (please explain her job in detail)

   ____

f. Housewife

g. Other (please specify)

____

Part II

As children grow up to be teenagers and young adults, they learn more and more about how their parents brought them up. We would like you to describe how your parents brought you up. Please read each statement on the following pages and circle the answer that most closely describes the way each of your parents acted or acts toward you. BE SURE TO MARK EACH ANSWER FOR EACH PARENT.

If you think that the statement describes a person who is NOT LIKE your parent, circle NL.

If you think that the statement describes a person who is SOMEWHAT LIKE your parent, circle SL.

If you think that the statement describes a person who is A LOT LIKE your parent, circle L.

FORM FOR MOTHER

MY MOTHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .	Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
1. . . . makes me feel better after talking over my worries with her.	NL	SL	L
2. . . . is not very patient with me.	NL	SL	L
3. . . . sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.	NL	SL	L
4. . . . wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.	NL	SL	L
5. . . . soon forgets a rule she has made.	NL	SL	L
6. . . . is easy with me.	NL	SL	L
7. . . . doesn't talk with me very much.	NL	SL	L
8. . . . will not talk with me when I displease her.	NL	SL	L
9. . . . is very strict with me.	NL	SL	L
10. . . . feels hurt when I do not follow advice.	NL	SL	L
11. . . . is always telling me how I should behave.	NL	SL	L
12. . . . usually does not find out about my misbehavior.	NL	SL	L
13. . . . spends very little time with me.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY MOTHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
14.	. . . almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.	NL	SL	L
15.	. . . is always thinking of things that will please me.	NL	SL	L
16.	. . . believes in having a lot of rules and sticking with them.	NL	SL	L
17.	. . . tells me how much she loves me.	NL	SL	L
18.	. . . is always checking on what I have been doing at school or play.	NL	SL	L
19.	. . . punishes me for doing something one day, but ignores it the next.	NL	SL	L
20.	. . . allows me to tell her if I think my ideas are better than hers.	NL	SL	L
21.	. . . lets me off easy when I do something wrong.	NL	SL	L
22.	. . . sometimes when she disapproves, does not say anything, but is cold and distant for a while.	NL	SL	L
23.	. . . forgets to help me when I need it.	NL	SL	L
24.	. . . sticks to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions.	NL	SL	L
25.	. . . tells me exactly how to do my work.	NL	SL	L
26.	. . . does not pay much attention to my misbehavior.	NL	SL	L
27.	. . . likes me to choose my own way of doing things.	NL	SL	L
28.	. . . if I break a promise, does not trust me again for a long time.	NL	SL	L
29.	. . . does not seem to think of me very often.	NL	SL	L
30.	. . . does not tell me what time to be at home when I go out.	NL	SL	L
31.	. . . gives me a lot of care and attention.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY MOTHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
32.	. . . believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way.	NL	SL	L
33.	. . . asks me to tell everything that happens when I am away from home.	NL	SL	L
34.	. . . does not forget very quickly the things I do wrong.	NL	SL	L
35.	. . . wants me to tell her if I do not like the way she treats me.	NL	SL	L
36.	. . . worries about me when I am away.	NL	SL	L
37.	. . . gives hard punishment.	NL	SL	L
38.	. . . believes in showing her love for me.	NL	SL	L
39.	. . . feels hurt by the things I do.	NL	SL	L
40.	. . . lets me help to decide to do things we are working on.	NL	SL	L
41.	. . . says some day I will be punished for my bad behavior.	NL	SL	L
42.	. . . gives me as much freedom as I want.	NL	SL	L
43.	. . . smiles at me very often.	NL	SL	L
44.	. . . is always getting after me.	NL	SL	L
45.	. . . keeps a careful check on me to make sure that I have the right kind of friends.	NL	SL	L
46.	. . . depends on her mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	NL	SL	L
47.	. . . excuses my bad conduct.	NL	SL	L
48.	. . . does not show that she loves me.	NL	SL	L
49.	. . . is less friendly with me if I do not see things her way.	NL	SL	L
50.	. . . is able to make me feel better when I am upset.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY MOTHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

	Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
51. . . . becomes very involved in my life.	NL	SL	L
52. . . . almost always complains about what I do.	NL	SL	L
53. . . . always listens to my ideas and opinions.	NL	SL	L
54. . . . would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time.	NL	SL	L
55. . . . does not check up to see whether I have done what she told me.	NL	SL	L
56. . . . thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after it is over.	NL	SL	L
57. . . . does not share many activities with me.	NL	SL	L
58. . . . lets me go any place I please without asking.	NL	SL	L
59. . . . enjoys doing things with me.	NL	SL	L
60. . . . makes me feel like the most important person in her life.	NL	SL	L
61. . . . gets cross and angry about little things I do.	NL	SL	L
62. . . . only keeps rules when it suits her.	NL	SL	L
63. . . . really wants me to tell her just how I feel about things.	NL	SL	L
64. . . . will avoid looking at me when I have disappointed her.	NL	SL	L
65. . . . usually makes me the center of her attention at home.	NL	SL	L
66. . . . often praises me.	NL	SL	L
67. . . . says if I love her, I would do what she wants me to do.	NL	SL	L
68. . . . seldom insists that I do anything.	NL	SL	L
69. . . . tries to understand how I see things.	NL	SL	L
70. . . . complains that I get on her nerves.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY MOTHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
71.	. . . does not work with me.	NL	SL	L
72.	. . . insists that I must do exactly as I am told.	NL	SL	L
73.	. . . asks people what I do away from home.	NL	SL	L
74.	. . . loses her temper with me when I do not help around the house.	NL	SL	L
75.	. . . does not insist I obey if I complain and protest.	NL	SL	L
76.	. . . cheers me up when I am sad.	NL	SL	L
77.	. . . sees to it that I obey when she tells me something.	NL	SL	L
78.	. . . tells me of all the things she has done for me.	NL	SL	L
79.	. . . wants to control whatever I do.	NL	SL	L
80.	. . . does not bother to enforce rules.	NL	SL	L
81.	. . . thinks that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.	NL	SL	L
82.	. . . is always finding fault with me.	NL	SL	L
83.	. . . often speaks of the good things I do.	NL	SL	L
84.	. . . makes her whole life center around her children.	NL	SL	L
85.	. . . does not seem to know what I need or want.	NL	SL	L
86.	. . . is happy to see me when I come home from school or play.	NL	SL	L
87.	. . . gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible.	NL	SL	L
88.	. . . if I have hurt her feelings, stops talking to me until I please her again.	NL	SL	L
89.	. . . worries that I cannot take care of myself unless she is around.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY MOTHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
90.	. . . hugged or kissed me goodnight when I was small.	NL	SL	L
91.	. . . says if I really cared for her, I would not do things that cause her to worry.	NL	SL	L
92.	. . . is always trying to change me.	NL	SL	L
93.	. . . is easy to talk to.	NL	SL	L
94.	. . . wishes I were a different kind of person.	NL	SL	L
95.	. . . lets me go out any evening I want.	NL	SL	L
96.	. . . seems proud of the things I do.	NL	SL	L
97.	. . . spends almost all of her free time with her children.	NL	SL	L
98.	. . . when I have certain jobs to do, does not allow me to do anything else until the jobs are done.	NL	SL	L
99.	. . . is very interested in what I am learning at school.	NL	SL	L
100.	. . . does not like the way I act at home.	NL	SL	L
101.	. . . changes her mind to make things easier for herself.	NL	SL	L
102.	. . . can be talked into things easily.	NL	SL	L
103.	. . . wishes I would stay home where she could take care of me.	NL	SL	L
104.	. . . makes me feel I am not loved.	NL	SL	L
105.	. . . has more rules than I can remember.	NL	SL	L
106.	. . . says I make her happy.	NL	SL	L
107.	. . . will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.	NL	SL	L
108.	. . . lets me do anything I like to do.	NL	SL	L

FORM FOR FATHER

MY FATHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
1.	. . . makes me feel better after talking over my worries with him.	NL	SL	L
2.	. . . is not very patient with me.	NL	SL	L
3.	. . . sees to it that I know exactly what I may or may not do.	NL	SL	L
4.	. . . wants to know exactly where I am and what I am doing.	NL	SL	L
5.	. . . soon forgets a rule he has made.	NL	SL	L
6.	. . . is easy with me.	NL	SL	L
7.	. . . doesn't talk with me very much.	NL	SL	L
8.	. . . will not talk with me when I displease him.	NL	SL	L
9.	. . . is very strict with me.	NL	SL	L
10.	. . . feels hurt when I do not follow advice.	NL	SL	L
11.	. . . is always telling me how I should behave.	NL	SL	L
12.	. . . usually does not find out about my misbehavior.	NL	SL	L
13.	. . . spends very little time with me.	NL	SL	L
14.	. . . almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.	NL	SL	L
15.	. . . is always thinking of things that will please me.	NL	SL	L
16.	. . . believes in having a lot of rules and sticking with them.	NL	SL	L
17.	. . . tells me how much he loves me.	NL	SL	L
18.	. . . is always checking on what I have been doing at school or play.	NL	SL	L
19.	. . . punishes me for doing something one day, but ignores it the next.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY FATHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

	Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
20. . . . allows me to tell him if I think my ideas are better than his.	NL	SL	L
21. . . . lets me off easy when I do something wrong.	NL	SL	L
22. . . . sometimes when he disapproves, does not say anything, but is cold and distant for a while.	NL	SL	L
23. . . . forgets to help me when I need it.	NL	SL	L
24. . . . sticks to a rule instead of allowing a lot of exceptions.	NL	SL	L
25. . . . tells me exactly how to do my work.	NL	SL	L
26. . . . does not pay much attention to my misbehavior.	NL	SL	L
27. . . . likes me to choose my own way of doing things.	NL	SL	L
28. . . . if I break a promise, does not trust me again for a long time.	NL	SL	L
29. . . . does not seem to think of me very often.	NL	SL	L
30. . . . does not tell me what time to be at home when I go out.	NL	SL	L
31. . . . gives me a lot of care and attention.	NL	SL	L
32. . . . believes that all my bad behavior should be punished in some way.	NL	SL	L
33. . . . asks me to tell everything that happens when I am away from home.	NL	SL	L
34. . . . does not forget very quickly the things I do wrong.	NL	SL	L
35. . . . wants me to tell him if I do not like the way he treats me.	NL	SL	L
36. . . . worries about me when I am away.	NL	SL	L
37. . . . gives hard punishment.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY FATHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

	Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
38. . . . believes in showing his love for me.	NL	SL	L
39. . . . feels hurt by the things I do.	NL	SL	L
40. . . . lets me help to decide to do things we are working on.	NL	SL	L
41. . . . says some day I will be punished for my bad behavior.	NL	SL	L
42. . . . gives me as much freedom as I want.	NL	SL	L
43. . . . smiles at me very often.	NL	SL	L
44. . . . is always getting after me.	NL	SL	L
45. . . . keeps a careful check on me to make sure that I have the right kind of friends.	NL	SL	L
46. . . . depends on his mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	NL	SL	L
47. . . . excuses my bad conduct.	NL	SL	L
48. . . . does not show that he loves me.	NL	SL	L
49. . . . is less friendly with me if I do not see things his way.	NL	SL	L
50. . . . is able to make me feel better when I am upset.	NL	SL	L
51. . . . becomes very involved in my life.	NL	SL	L
52. . . . almost always complains about what I do.	NL	SL	L
53. . . . always listens to my ideas and opinions.	NL	SL	L
54. . . . would like to be able to tell me what to do all the time.	NL	SL	L
55. . . . does not check up to see whether I have done what he told me.	NL	SL	L
56. . . . thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after it is over.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY FATHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
57.	. . . does not share many activities with me.	NL	SL	L
58.	. . . lets me go any place I please without asking.	NL	SL	L
59.	. . . enjoys doing things with me.	NL	SL	L
60.	. . . makes me feel like the most important person in his life.	NL	SL	L
61.	. . . gets cross and angry about little things I do.	NL	SL	L
62.	. . . only keeps rules when it suits him.	NL	SL	L
63.	. . . really wants me to tell him just how I feel about things.	NL	SL	L
64.	. . . will avoid looking at me when I have disappointed him.	NL	SL	L
65.	. . . usually makes me the center of his attention at home.	NL	SL	L
66.	. . . often praises me.	NL	SL	L
67.	. . . says if I love him, I would do what he wants me to do.	NL	SL	L
68.	. . . seldom insists that I do anything.	NL	SL	L
69.	. . . tries to understand how I see things.	NL	SL	L
70.	. . . complains that I get on his nerves.	NL	SL	L
71.	. . . does not work with me.	NL	SL	L
72.	. . . insists that I must do exactly as I am told.	NL	SL	L
73.	. . . asks people what I do away from home.	NL	SL	L
74.	. . . loses his temper with me when I do not help around the house.	NL	SL	L
75.	. . . does not insist I obey if I complain and protest.	NL	SL	L
76.	. . . cheers me up when I am sad.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY FATHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
77.	. . . sees to it that I obey when he tells me something.	NL	SL	L
78.	. . . tells me of all the things he has done for me.	NL	SL	L
79.	. . . wants to control whatever I do.	NL	SL	L
80.	. . . does not bother to enforce rules.	NL	SL	L
81.	. . . thinks that any misbehavior is very serious and will have future consequences.	NL	SL	L
82.	. . . is always finding fault with me.	NL	SL	L
83.	. . . often speaks of the good things I do.	NL	SL	L
84.	. . . makes his whole life center around his children.	NL	SL	L
85.	. . . does not seem to know what I need or want.	NL	SL	L
86.	. . . is happy to see me when I come home from school or play.	NL	SL	L
87.	. . . gives me the choice of what to do whenever possible.	NL	SL	L
88.	. . . if I have hurt his feelings, stops talking to me until I please his again.	NL	SL	L
89.	. . . worries that I cannot take care of myself unless he is around.	NL	SL	L
90.	. . . hugged or kissed me goodnight when I was small.	NL	SL	L
91.	. . . says if I really cared for him, I would not do things that cause him to worry.	NL	SL	L
92.	. . . is always trying to change me.	NL	SL	L
93.	. . . is easy to talk to.	NL	SL	L
94.	. . . wishes I were a different kind of person.	NL	SL	L
95.	. . . lets me go out any evening I want.	NL	SL	L

NL = Not Like, SL = Somewhat Like, L = A Lot Like

MY FATHER IS A PERSON WHO . . .

		Not Like	Somewhat Like	A Lot Like
96.	. . . seems proud of the things I do.	NL	SL	L
97.	. . . spends almost all of his free time with his children.	NL	SL	L
98.	. . . when I have certain jobs to do, does not allow me to do anything else until the jobs are done.	NL	SL	L
99.	. . . is very interested in what I am learning at school.	NL	SL	L
100.	. . . does not like the way I act at home.	NL	SL	L
101.	. . . changes his mind to make things easier for himself.	NL	SL	L
102.	. . . can be talked into things easily.	NL	SL	L
103.	. . . wishes I would stay home where he could take care of me.	NL	SL	L
104.	. . . makes me feel I am not loved.	NL	SL	L
105.	. . . has more rules than I can remember.	NL	SL	L
106.	. . . says I make him happy.	NL	SL	L
107.	. . . will talk to me again and again about anything bad I do.	NL	SL	L
108.	. . . lets me do anything I like to do.	NL	SL	L

Part III

This questionnaire is conducted to ask your opinion about certain things which you can see in different role situations in your daily life. Different situations will be used in each role. Make your own decision on what and how you would react in each case.

Example: Between you (as a student) and your teacher, would you

(0) want to fall asleep when he/she is teaching?

Answering: Make a circle around the scale number you want to respond to. There are 5 scale numbers in each item as follows:

do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not

From (0) you are supposed to consider as a student how much you dare or dare not fall asleep while your teacher is teaching.

If you think you dare to do it for sure, then circle number 2.

If you think you will care and be afraid of your teacher, but you might do so while you are out of his/her sight, then circle number 1.

If, on the other hand, you think that you care too much for your teacher or are so fearful of him/her that you could not do anything like that, you should then circle number -2 or -1 as the degree of your feeling.

Circle 0 if you cannot make a clear-cut decision as to which way to go.

A. Between you (as a student) and your teacher, would you

1.	borrow money or things?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
2.	come to class later than your teacher?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
3.	object and do not agree with your teacher?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
4.	see him/her in his/her room for your private business?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
5.	break the law of the class, making a loud noise?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
6.	ask for his/her help while he/she is working?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
7.	ask for his/her help while he/she is taking a nap?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
8.	ask for his/her help while he/she is eating?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
9.	bring out your ideas and reasons against his/hers in the class?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
10.	remind him/her when the time is up if you know that he/she is going on teaching?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not

B. Concerning you and your close friend, would you

11.	ask for his/her help?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
12.	come late when you have an appointment with your opposite-sex friend?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
13.	disturb him/her while he/she is sleeping?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
14.	blame him/her when he/she misses an appointment?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
15.	confront him/her directly when he/she does something wrong?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
16.	borrow things or money from him/her?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
17.	ask for your things back when he/she has borrowed from you for a long time?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
18.	take your friend's things and use them without giving him/her notice?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
19.	let your friend wait for you when you are doing something?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
20.	present your idea and reject his/hers if you do not agree with him/her?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not

C. In relation to you and your parents, would you

21.	get up late?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
22.	ask for more money if you do not have enough to spend?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
23.	ask for their permission to let you go and stay overnight with your friend?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
24.	ask for their help, such as making your clothes?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
25.	give your father money when he asks, even though it comes from your accumulated allowance?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
26.	ask for their money to buy your own jacket?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
27.	show your reasonable ideas to reject theirs?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
28.	stay out late at night and call them to open the door for you?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
29.	not come home on time after not giving them notice in advance?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
30.	ask your friends to come to a party at your home?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not

D. To a person you feel indebted to (because of favors), would you

31.	consult with him/her about your problems?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
32.	ask for his/her help?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
33.	ask him/her to recommend you to work in a company?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
34.	show him/her your anger when you dislike him/her?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
35.	present your reasonable ideas to contrast his/hers?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
36.	ask for payment when you work for him/her?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
37.	accept when he/she asks you to go to school in his/her car every day?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
38.	accept his/her compensation for damages done to some of your things?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
39.	ask him/her to turn down his/her radio when you are reading?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
40.	remind him/her when you see him/her do something wrong?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not

E. In relation to a student-friend who is below your class (grade), would you

41.	blame him/her when he/she misses an appointment with you?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
42.	let him/her wait for you when you are doing something?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
43.	disturb him/her while he/she is sleeping?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
44.	ask for your things back when he/she has borrowed them for a long time?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not
45.	take his/her things and use them without giving him/her notice?	do	2	1	0	-1	-2	do not

Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix E-2

The Thai CRPBI-108

แบบสอบถามการรับรู้พฤติกรรมของบิดามารดา

เมื่อนักเรียนเติบโตขึ้นเป็นวัยรุ่นและคนหนุ่มสาว นักเรียนจะเริ่มเข้าใจมากขึ้นเรื่อยๆ ว่าบิดามารดาเลี้ยงดูสั่งสอนนักเรียนมาอย่างไร อยากให้นักเรียนอธิบายวิธีที่บิดามารดาได้เลี้ยงดูนักเรียนมา โดยอ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้ทีละข้อความ แล้ววงกลมรอบคำตอบที่บรรยายถึงวิธีที่บิดามารดาปฏิบัติต่อนักเรียนได้ใกล้เคียงที่สุด โปรดเลือกเพียงหนึ่งคำตอบ ในแต่ละข้อความเท่านั้น

ถ้านักเรียนคิดว่า ข้อความนั้นบรรยายลักษณะที่ไม่เหมือนกับการกระทำของบิดามารดาที่มีต่อนักเรียน ให้วงที่ ม.ม.

ถ้านักเรียนคิดว่า ข้อความนั้นบรรยายลักษณะที่ค่อนข้างเหมือนกับการกระทำของบิดามารดาที่มีต่อนักเรียน ให้วงที่ ค.ม.

ถ้านักเรียนคิดว่า ข้อความนั้นบรรยายลักษณะที่เหมือนกับการกระทำของบิดามารดาที่มีต่อนักเรียนมากๆ ให้วงที่ ม.

คำถามที่เกี่ยวกับมารดา

มารดาของฉันคือผู้ที่...		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมากๆ
1	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกสบายใจขึ้นหลังจากฉันได้คุยเรื่องที่ฉันกลุ้มใจให้ท่านฟัง	มม	คม	ม
2	ไม่ค่อยจะอดทนกับการกระทำในเรื่องต่างๆ ของฉันเลย	มม	คม	ม
3	คอยดูว่าฉันรู้หรือไม่ ในสิ่งที่ฉันควรจะทำหรือไม่ควรจะทำ	มม	คม	ม
4	ต้องการรู้ให้แน่ใจว่า ฉันอยู่ที่ไหนและกำลังทำอะไรอยู่	มม	คม	ม
5	ตั้งกฎข้อบังคับขึ้นมาเอง แล้วอีกไม่นานก็ลืม	มม	คม	ม
6	ง่ายๆ ไม่เข้มงวดกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
7	ไม่ค่อยพูดคุยกับฉันนัก	มม	คม	ม

	มารดาของฉันคือผู้ที่	ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
8	จะไม่ยอมพูดกับฉัน ถ้าฉันทำให้ท่านไม่พอใจ	มม	คม	ม
9	เข้มงวดกวดขันกับฉันมากๆ	มม	คม	ม
10	รู้สึกเสียใจเมื่อฉันไม่ทำตามคำแนะนำของท่าน	มม	คม	ม
11	คอยบอกฉันอยู่เสมอว่า ฉันควรประพฤติตัวอย่างไร	มม	คม	ม
12	มักจะไม่ค่อยรู้การทำตัวที่ไม่ดีของฉัน	มม	คม	ม
13	ให้เวลากับฉันน้อยมาก	มม	คม	ม
14	พูดคุยกับฉันด้วยเสียงที่แสดงถึงความอบอุ่น และเป็นมิตรแทบทุกครั้ง	มม	คม	ม
15	มักจะคิดถึงแต่สิ่งที่จะทำให้ฉันชอบอยู่เสมอ	มม	คม	ม
16	เชื่อในการที่มีกฎเกณฑ์มากมาย และทำตามกฎเกณฑ์เหล่านั้นอย่างเคร่งครัด	มม	คม	ม
17	บอกฉันว่า ท่านรักฉันมากเพียงไร	มม	คม	ม
18	คอยสำรวจอยู่ประจำว่า ฉันทำหรือเล่นอะไรที่โรงเรียน	มม	คม	ม
19	ลงโทษเมื่อฉันทำผิด แต่ไม่สนใจที่จะทำโทษอีกถ้าทำผิดซ้ำ	มม	คม	ม
20	อนุญาตให้ฉันออกความเห็นได้ ถ้าฉันคิดว่าความคิดของฉันดีกว่าความคิดของท่าน	มม	คม	ม
21	จะปล่อยให้ฉันผ่านไปง่ายๆ โดยไม่ทำโทษ เมื่อฉันทำผิด	มม	คม	ม
22	บางครั้งเมื่อท่านไม่พอใจ จะไม่ยอมพูดอะไรเลยแต่จะทำตัวเย็นชาและห่างเหินกับฉันไปพักหนึ่ง	มม	คม	ม
23	ลืมที่จะช่วยเหลือฉันยามที่ฉันต้องการ	มม	คม	ม
24	ยึดมั่นในกฎเกณฑ์ แทนที่จะยอมให้มีข้อยกเว้นบ้าง	มม	คม	ม
25	ชอบสอนฉันว่า ต้องทำอย่างนั้นอย่างนี้เวลาฉันทำอะไรก็ตาม	มม	คม	ม
26	ไม่ค่อยสนใจนักกับการกระทำผิดของฉัน	มม	คม	ม

มารดาของฉันคือผู้ที่

		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมากๆ
27	ชอบให้ฉันเลือกแนวทางการกระทำสิ่งต่างๆ ด้วยตัวของฉันเอง	มม	คม	ม
28	ถ้าฉันทำผิดสัญญา จะไม่ไว้ใจฉันไปอีกนานทีเดียว	มม	คม	ม
29	ดูเหมือนว่า จะไม่ค่อยคิดถึงฉันมากเท่าไรนัก	มม	คม	ม
30	ไม่เคยบอกกับฉันว่า ควรกลับมาบ้านกี่โมง เมื่อฉันออกไปเที่ยว	มม	คม	ม
31	ให้ความดูแลและเอาใจใส่กับฉันมาก	มม	คม	ม
32	เชื่อว่าการกระทำผิดของฉันทั้งหมด ควรได้รับการลงโทษโดยวิธีใดวิธีหนึ่ง	มม	คม	ม
33	ขอให้ฉันเล่าทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างที่เกิดขึ้นกับฉันเมื่ออยู่ไกลบ้าน	มม	คม	ม
34	ไม่ลืมสิ่งที่ฉันทำผิดได้ง่ายๆ	มม	คม	ม
35	ต้องการให้ฉันบอกท่าน ถ้าฉันไม่ชอบวิธีการที่ท่านปฏิบัติต่อฉัน	มม	คม	ม
36	เป็นห่วงฉันเวลาฉันไปไหนไกลๆ	มม	คม	ม
37	ลงโทษฉันอย่างรุนแรง	มม	คม	ม
38	เชื่อในการแสดงความรักของท่านที่มีต่อฉัน	มม	คม	ม
39	รู้สึกเสียใจเมื่อฉันทำสิ่งที่ไม่ดีลงไป	มม	คม	ม
40	ให้ฉันช่วยตัดสินใจในสิ่งที่เรากำลังทำอยู่ด้วยกัน	มม	คม	ม
41	พูดว่าสักวันหนึ่ง ฉันจะต้องถูกลงโทษที่ทำตัวไม่ดี	มม	คม	ม
42	ให้อิสระแก่ฉันมากเท่าที่ฉันต้องการ	มม	คม	ม
43	ยิ้มให้ฉันบ่อยๆ	มม	คม	ม
44	คอยจับผิดฉันอยู่ตลอดเวลา	มม	คม	ม
45	คอยสอดส่องให้แน่ใจว่า ฉันคบแต่เพื่อนดีๆ	มม	คม	ม
46	จะทำตามกฎที่ตั้งไว้หรือไม่ก็แล้วแต่อารมณ์ของท่าน	มม	คม	ม
47	ยกโทษให้เมื่อฉันทำผิด	มม	คม	ม
48	ไม่ได้แสดงออกว่าท่านรักฉัน	มม	คม	ม
49	ไม่ค่อยเป็นมิตรกับฉัน หากฉันไม่เห็นด้วยกับท่าน	มม	คม	ม
50	สามารถทำให้ฉันรู้สึกสบายใจขึ้น เมื่อฉันไม่สบายใจ	มม	คม	ม

มารดาของฉันคือผู้ที่

		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
51	เอาใจใส่กับชีวิตของฉันมาก	มม	คม	ม
52	ชอบบ่นอยู่เสมอเวลาฉันทำอะไรก็ตาม	มม	คม	ม
53	รับฟังความคิดและข้อคิดเห็นของฉันเสมอ	มม	คม	ม
54	อยากที่จะบอกฉันให้ทำอะไรต่อมิอะไรตลอดเวลา	มม	คม	ม
55	ไม่เคยตรวจสอบดูว่า ฉันทำตามสิ่งที่ท่านบอกไว้หรือไม่	มม	คม	ม
56	คิดและพูดถึงแต่การกระทำที่ไม่ดีของฉันทั้งๆ ที่เรื่องนั้นสิ้นสุดลงไปนานแล้ว	มม	คม	ม
57	ไม่ค่อยได้ทำกิจกรรมต่างๆ ร่วมกับฉันมากนัก	มม	คม	ม
58	อนุญาตให้ฉันไปในที่ต่างๆ ที่ฉันพอใจจะไปโดยไม่ซักถาม	มม	คม	ม
59	ชอบที่จะทำสิ่งต่างๆ ร่วมกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
60	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกว่า ฉันเป็นบุคคลที่สำคัญที่สุดในชีวิตของท่าน	มม	คม	ม
61	ไม่พอใจและโกรธเกี่ยวกับเรื่องเล็กๆ น้อยๆ ที่ฉันทำ	มม	คม	ม
62	รักษากฎเกณฑ์ต่างๆ ที่ถูกใจท่านไว้เท่านั้น	มม	คม	ม
63	ต้องการให้ฉันบอกท่านเกี่ยวกับความรู้สึกที่แท้จริงที่ฉันมีต่อสิ่งต่างๆ	มม	คม	ม
64	จะไม่มองหน้าฉัน ถ้าฉันทำให้ท่านผิดหวัง	มม	คม	ม
65	มักทำให้ฉันเป็นจุดสนใจของท่าน เมื่อฉันอยู่บ้าน	มม	คม	ม
66	กล่าวชมฉันบ่อยๆ	มม	คม	ม
67	พูดว่าหากฉันรักท่าน ฉันควรจะทำในสิ่งที่ท่านต้องการให้ฉันทำ	มม	คม	ม
68	ไม่ค่อยบังคับให้ฉันทำสิ่งใดเลย	มม	คม	ม
69	พยายามที่จะเข้าใจว่า ฉันเข้าใจสิ่งต่างๆ อย่างไร	มม	คม	ม
70	บ่นว่าฉันทำให้ท่านอารมณ์เสีย	มม	คม	ม
71	ไม่เคยทำอะไรร่วมกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
72	บังคับว่าฉันต้องทำตามที่ท่านบอกอย่างเคร่งครัด	มม	คม	ม
73	คอยถามคนอื่นๆ ว่าฉันทำอะไรเมื่ออยู่ห่างบ้าน	มม	คม	ม

	มารดาของฉันคือผู้ที่	ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
74	อารมณ์เสียเมื่อฉันไม่ช่วยงานบ้าน	มม	คม	ม
75	ไม่บังคับให้ฉันต้องเชื่อฟังท่าน เมื่อฉันบ่นหรือไม่เห็นด้วยกับท่าน	มม	คม	ม
76	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกดีขึ้น เมื่อฉันไม่สบายใจ	มม	คม	ม
77	คอยดูว่าฉันจะเชื่อฟังในสิ่งที่ท่านบอกฉันไปหรือไม่	มม	คม	ม
78	บอกฉันถึงทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างที่ท่านได้ทำเพื่อตัวฉัน	มม	คม	ม
79	ต้องการจะควบคุมฉันไปเสียทุกเรื่อง	มม	คม	ม
80	ไม่ค่อยสนใจที่จะใช้กฎเกณฑ์ต่างๆ กับฉันนัก	มม	คม	ม
81	คิดว่าพฤติกรรมที่ไม่ดีเป็นสิ่งร้ายแรง และจะมีผลตามมาในอนาคต	มม	คม	ม
82	มักจะหาข้อบกพร่องในตัวฉันเสมอ	มม	คม	ม
83	มักกล่าวถึงแต่สิ่งดีๆ ที่ฉันได้ทำไป	มม	คม	ม
84	ทำชีวิตทั้งหมดของท่านให้เป็นศูนย์กลางของลูกๆ	มม	คม	ม
85	ดูเหมือนไม่รู้ว่า ฉันต้องการหรืออยากได้อะไร	มม	คม	ม
86	มีความสุขที่เห็นฉันกลับจากโรงเรียนหรือกลับจากเล่นมา	มม	คม	ม
87	ให้ฉันเลือกทำสิ่งต่างๆ เองเมื่อมีโอกาส	มม	คม	ม
88	หากฉันทำให้ท่านเสียใจ ท่านจะหยุดพูดกับฉันจนกว่าฉันจะทำให้ท่านพอใจอีกครั้ง	มม	คม	ม
89	กังวลใจว่าฉันจะดูแลตัวเองไม่ได้ เมื่อท่านไม่ได้อยู่ด้วยกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
90	กอดหรือหอมแก้มฉันก่อนเข้านอน เมื่อฉันยังเป็นเด็กเล็กๆ อยู่	มม	คม	ม
91	พูดกับฉันว่า ถ้าฉันรักท่านจริง ฉันจะต้องไม่ทำอะไรให้ท่านเป็นห่วง	มม	คม	ม
92	พยายามที่จะเปลี่ยนแปลงเกี่ยวกับตัวฉันอยู่เสมอ	มม	คม	ม
93	พูดคุยด้วยได้อย่างสบายๆ	มม	คม	ม
94	อยากให้ฉันเป็นบุคคลที่แตกต่างจากที่ฉันเป็นอยู่	มม	คม	ม

มารดาของฉันคือผู้ที่

		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
95	อนุญาตให้ฉันออกไปเที่ยวข้างนอกคืนไหนก็ได้ ตามที่ฉันต้องการ	มม	คม	ม
96	ดูเหมือนว่าจะภาคภูมิใจในสิ่งดีๆ ที่ฉันทำ	มม	คม	ม
97	ใช้เวลาว่างที่ท่านมีอยู่เกือบทั้งหมดกับลูกๆ	มม	คม	ม
98	เมื่อฉันมีงานชิ้นหนึ่งที่ต้องทำ ท่านจะไม่อนุญาตให้ฉันทำอย่างอื่นจนกว่างานที่ฉันทำอยู่นั้นจะเสร็จ	มม	คม	ม
99	สนใจในสิ่งที่ฉันกำลังเรียนรู้จากโรงเรียนมาก	มม	คม	ม
100	ไม่ชอบการทำตัวของฉันเวลาฉันอยู่บ้าน	มม	คม	ม
101	เปลี่ยนใจในการกระทำสิ่งต่างๆ ต่อฉัน เพื่อให้อะไรๆ มันง่ายขึ้นสำหรับตัวท่านเองเท่านั้น	มม	คม	ม
102	ถูกพูดจูงใจให้เชื่ออะไรได้ง่ายๆ	มม	คม	ม
103	อยากให้ฉันอยู่บ้านเพื่อท่านจะได้คอยดูแลฉัน	มม	คม	ม
104	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกว่าท่านไม่ได้รักฉันเลย	มม	คม	ม
105	มีกฎข้อบังคับมากเกินกว่าที่ฉันจะจำได้	มม	คม	ม
106	พูดว่าฉันทำให้ท่านมีความสุข	มม	คม	ม
107	จะพูดกับฉันซ้ำแล้วซ้ำอีกว่าฉันเคยทำอะไรไม่ดีไว้บ้าง	มม	คม	ม
108	ปล่อยให้ฉันทำอะไรก็ได้ตามที่ฉันอยากจะทำ	มม	คม	ม

คำถามที่เกี่ยวกับบิดา

บิดาของฉันคือผู้ที่		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
1	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกสบายใจขึ้นหลังจากฉันได้คุยเรื่องที่ฉันกลุ้มใจให้ท่านฟัง	มม	คม	ม
2	ไม่ค่อยจะอดทนกับการกระทำในเรื่องต่างๆ ของฉันเลย	มม	คม	ม
3	คอยดูว่าฉันรู้หรือไม่ ในสิ่งที่ฉันควรจะทำหรือไม่ควรจะทำ	มม	คม	ม
4	ต้องการรู้ให้แน่ใจว่า ฉันอยู่ที่ไหนและกำลังทำอะไรอยู่	มม	คม	ม
5	ตั้งกฎข้อบังคับขึ้นมาเอง แล้วอีกไม่นานก็ลืม	มม	คม	ม
6	ง่ายๆ ไม่เข้มงวดกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
7	ไม่ค่อยพูดคุยกับฉันนัก	มม	คม	ม
8	จะไม่ยอมพูดกับฉัน ถ้าฉันทำให้ท่านไม่พอใจ	มม	คม	ม
9	เข้มงวดกวดขันกับฉันมากๆ	มม	คม	ม
10	รู้สึกเสียใจเมื่อฉันไม่ทำตามคำแนะนำของท่าน	มม	คม	ม
11	คอยบอกฉันอยู่เสมอว่า ฉันควรประพฤติตัวอย่างไร	มม	คม	ม
12	มักจะไม่ค่อยรู้การทำตัวที่ไม่ดีของฉัน	มม	คม	ม
13	ให้เวลากับฉันน้อยมาก	มม	คม	ม
14	พูดคุยกับฉันด้วยเสียงที่แสดงถึงความอบอุ่น และเป็นมิตรแทบทุกครั้ง	มม	คม	ม
15	มักจะคิดถึงแต่สิ่งที่จะทำให้ฉันชอบอยู่เสมอ	มม	คม	ม
16	เชื่อในการที่มีกฎเกณฑ์มากมาย และทำตามกฎเกณฑ์เหล่านั้นอย่างเคร่งครัด	มม	คม	ม
17	บอกฉันว่า ท่านรักฉันมากเพียงไร	มม	คม	ม
18	คอยสำรวจอยู่ประจำว่า ฉันทำหรือเล่นอะไรที่โรงเรียน	มม	คม	ม
19	ลงโทษเมื่อฉันทำผิด แต่ไม่สนใจที่จะทำโทษอีกถ้าทำผิดซ้ำ	มม	คม	ม
20	อนุญาตให้ฉันออกความเห็นได้ ถ้าฉันคิดว่าความคิดของฉันดีกว่าความคิดของท่าน	มม	คม	ม

บิดาของฉันคือผู้ที่

		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
21	จะปล่อยให้ฉันผ่านไปง่ายๆ โดยไม่ทำโทษ เมื่อฉันทำผิด	มม	คม	ม
22	บางครั้งเมื่อท่านไม่พอใจ จะไม่ยอมพูดอะไรเลยแต่จะทำตัวเย็นชาและห่างเหินกับฉันไปพักหนึ่ง	มม	คม	ม
23	ลืมที่จะช่วยเหลือฉันยามที่ฉันต้องการ	มม	คม	ม
24	ยึดมั่นในกฎเกณฑ์ แทนที่จะยอมให้มีข้อยกเว้นบ้าง	มม	คม	ม
25	ชอบสอนฉันว่า ต้องทำอย่างนั้นอย่างนี้เวลาฉันทำอะไรก็ตาม	มม	คม	ม
26	ไม่ค่อยสนใจนักกับการกระทำผิดของฉัน	มม	คม	ม
27	ชอบให้ฉันเลือกแนวทางการกระทำสิ่งต่างๆ ด้วยตัวของฉันเอง	มม	คม	ม
28	ถ้าฉันทำผิดสัญญา จะไม่ไว้ใจฉันไปอีกนานทีเดียว	มม	คม	ม
29	ดูเหมือนว่า จะไม่ค่อยคิดถึงฉันมากเท่าไรนัก	มม	คม	ม
30	ไม่เคยบอกกับฉันว่า ควรกลับมาบ้านกี่โมง เมื่อฉันออกไปเที่ยว	มม	คม	ม
31	ให้ความดูแลและเอาใจใส่กับฉันมาก	มม	คม	ม
32	เชื่อว่าการกระทำผิดของฉันทั้งหมด ควรได้รับการลงโทษโดยวิธีใดวิธีหนึ่ง	มม	คม	ม
33	ขอให้ฉันเล่าทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างที่เกิดขึ้นกับฉันเมื่ออยู่ไกลบ้าน	มม	คม	ม
34	ไม่ลืมสิ่งที่ฉันทำผิดได้ง่ายๆ	มม	คม	ม
35	ต้องการให้ฉันบอกท่าน ถ้าฉันไม่ชอบวิธีการที่ท่านปฏิบัติต่อฉัน	มม	คม	ม
36	เป็นห่วงฉันเวลาฉันไปไหนไกลๆ	มม	คม	ม
37	ลงโทษฉันอย่างรุนแรง	มม	คม	ม
38	เชื่อในการแสดงความรักของท่านที่มีต่อฉัน	มม	คม	ม
39	รู้สึกเสียใจเมื่อฉันทำสิ่งที่ไม่ดีลงไป	มม	คม	ม
40	ให้ฉันช่วยตัดสินใจในสิ่งที่เรากำลังทำอยู่ด้วยกัน	มม	คม	ม
41	พูดว่าสักวันหนึ่ง ฉันจะต้องถูกลงโทษที่ทำตัวไม่ดี	มม	คม	ม

บิดาของฉันคือผู้ที่

		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
42	ให้อิสระแก่ฉันมากเท่าที่ฉันต้องการ			
43	ยิ้มให้ฉันบ่อยๆ	มม	คม	ม
44	คอยจับผิดฉันอยู่ตลอดเวลา	มม	คม	ม
45	คอยสอดส่องให้แน่ใจว่า ฉันคบแต่เพื่อนดีๆ	มม	คม	ม
46	จะทำตามกฎที่ตั้งไว้หรือไม่ก็แล้วแต่อารมณ์ของท่าน	มม	คม	ม
47	ยกโทษให้เมื่อฉันทำผิด	มม	คม	ม
48	ไม่ได้แสดงออกว่าท่านรักฉัน	มม	คม	ม
49	ไม่ค่อยเป็นมิตรกับฉัน หากฉันไม่เห็นด้วยกับท่าน	มม	คม	ม
50	สามารถทำให้ฉันรู้สึกสบายใจขึ้น เมื่อฉันไม่สบายใจ	มม	คม	ม
51	เอาใจใส่กับชีวิตของฉันมาก	มม	คม	ม
52	ชอบบ่นอยู่เสมอเวลาฉันทำอะไรก็ตาม	มม	คม	ม
53	รับฟังความคิดและข้อคิดเห็นของฉันเสมอ	มม	คม	ม
54	อยากที่จะบอกฉันให้ทำอะไรต่อมิอะไรตลอดเวลา	มม	คม	ม
55	ไม่เคยตรวจสอบดูว่า ฉันทำตามสิ่งที่ท่านบอกไว้หรือไม่	มม	คม	ม
56	คิดและพูดถึงแต่การกระทำที่ไม่ดีของฉันทั้งๆ ที่เรื่องนั้นสิ้นสุดลงไปนานแล้ว	มม	คม	ม
57	ไม่ค่อยได้ทำกิจกรรมต่างๆ ร่วมกับฉันมากนัก	มม	คม	ม
58	อนุญาตให้ฉันไปในที่ต่างๆ ที่ฉันพอใจจะไปโดยไม่ซักถาม	มม	คม	ม
59	ชอบที่จะทำสิ่งต่างๆ ร่วมกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
60	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกว่า ฉันเป็นบุคคลที่สำคัญที่สุดในชีวิตของท่าน	มม	คม	ม
61	ไม่พอใจและโกรธเกี่ยวกับเรื่องเล็กๆ น้อยๆ ที่ฉันทำ	มม	คม	ม
62	รักษากฎเกณฑ์ต่างๆ ที่ถูกใจท่านไว้เท่านั้น	มม	คม	ม
63.	ต้องการให้ฉันบอกท่านเกี่ยวกับความรู้สึกที่แท้จริงที่ฉันมีต่อสิ่งต่างๆ	มม	คม	ม
64	จะไม่มองหน้าฉัน ถ้าฉันทำให้ท่านผิดหวัง	มม	คม	ม
65.	มักทำให้ฉันเป็นจุดสนใจของท่าน เมื่อฉันอยู่บ้าน	มม	คม	ม

	บิดาของฉันคือผู้ที่	ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมาก
66	กล่าวชมฉันบ่อยๆ	มม	คม	ม
67	พูดว่าหากฉันรักท่าน ฉันควรจะทำในสิ่งที่ท่านต้องการให้ฉันทำ	มม	คม	ม
68	ไม่ค่อยบังคับให้ฉันทำสิ่งใดเลย	มม	คม	ม
69	พยายามที่จะเข้าใจว่า ฉันเข้าใจสิ่งต่างๆ อย่างไร	มม	คม	ม
70	บ่นว่าฉันทำให้ท่านอารมณ์เสีย	มม	คม	ม
71	ไม่เคยทำอะไรร่วมกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
72	บังคับว่าฉันต้องทำตามที่ท่านบอกอย่างเคร่งครัด	มม	คม	ม
73	คอยถามคนอื่นๆ ว่าฉันทำอะไรเมื่ออยู่ห่างบ้าน	มม	คม	ม
74	อารมณ์เสียเมื่อฉันไม่ช่วยงานบ้าน	มม	คม	ม
75	ไม่บังคับให้ฉันต้องเชื่อฟังท่าน เมื่อฉันบ่นหรือไม่เห็นด้วยกับท่าน	มม	คม	ม
76	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกดีขึ้น เมื่อฉันไม่สบายใจ	มม	คม	ม
77	คอยดูว่าฉันจะเชื่อฟังในสิ่งที่ท่านบอกฉันไปหรือไม่	มม	คม	ม
78	บอกฉันถึงทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างที่ท่านได้ทำเพื่อตัวฉัน	มม	คม	ม
79	ต้องการจะควบคุมฉันไปเสียทุกเรื่อง	มม	คม	ม
80	ไม่ค่อยสนใจที่จะใช้กฎเกณฑ์ต่างๆ กับฉันนัก	มม	คม	ม
81	คิดว่าพฤติกรรมที่ไม่ดีเป็นสิ่งร้ายแรง และจะมีผลตามมาในอนาคต	มม	คม	ม
82	มักจะหาข้อบกพร่องในตัวฉันเสมอ	มม	คม	ม
83.	มักกล่าวถึงแต่สิ่งดีๆ ที่ฉันได้ทำไป	มม	คม	ม
84	ทำชีวิตทั้งหมดของท่านให้เป็นศูนย์กลางของลูกๆ	มม	คม	ม
85	ดูเหมือนไม่รู้ว่า ฉันต้องการหรืออยากได้อะไร	มม	คม	ม
86	มีความสุขที่เห็นฉันกลับจากโรงเรียนหรือกลับจากเล่นมา	มม	คม	ม
87	ให้ฉันเลือกทำสิ่งต่างๆ เองเมื่อมีโอกาส	มม	คม	ม
88.	หากฉันทำให้ท่านเสียใจ ท่านจะหยุดพูดกับฉันจนกว่าฉันจะทำให้ท่านพอใจอีกครั้ง	มม	คม	ม

บิดาของฉันคือผู้ที่		ไม่เหมือน	ค่อนข้างเหมือน	เหมือนมากๆ
89	กังวลใจว่าฉันจะดูแลตัวเองไม่ได้ เมื่อท่านไม่ได้อยู่ด้วยกับฉัน	มม	คม	ม
90	กอดหรือหอมแก้มฉันก่อนเข้านอน เมื่อฉันยังเป็นเด็กเล็กๆ อยู่	มม	คม	ม
91	พูดกับฉันว่า ถ้าฉันรักท่านจริง ฉันจะต้องไม่ทำอะไรให้ท่านเป็นห่วง	มม	คม	ม
92	พยายามที่จะเปลี่ยนแปลงเกี่ยวกับตัวฉันอยู่เสมอ	มม	คม	ม
93	พูดคุยด้วยได้อย่างสบายๆ	มม	คม	ม
94	อยากให้ฉันเป็นบุคคลที่แตกต่างจากที่ฉันเป็นอยู่	มม	คม	ม
95	อนุญาตให้ฉันออกไปเที่ยวข้างนอกคืนไหนก็ได้ตามที่ฉันต้องการ	มม	คม	ม
96	ดูเหมือนว่าจะภาคภูมิใจในสิ่งดีๆ ที่ฉันทำ	มม	คม	ม
97	ใช้เวลาว่างที่ท่านมีอยู่เกือบทั้งหมดกับลูกๆ	มม	คม	ม
98	เมื่อฉันมีงานชิ้นหนึ่งที่ต้องทำ ท่านจะไม่อนุญาตให้ฉันทำอย่างอื่นจนกว่างานที่ฉันทำอยู่นั้นจะเสร็จ	มม	คม	ม
99	สนใจในสิ่งที่ฉันกำลังเรียนรู้จากโรงเรียนมาก	มม	คม	ม
100	ไม่ชอบการทำตัวของฉันเวลาฉันอยู่บ้าน	มม	คม	ม
101.	เปลี่ยนใจในการกระทำสิ่งต่างๆ ต่อฉัน เพื่อให้อะไรๆ มันง่ายขึ้นสำหรับตัวท่านเองเท่านั้น	มม	คม	ม
102.	ถูกพูดจูงใจให้เชื่ออะไรได้ง่ายๆ	มม	คม	ม
103.	อยากให้ฉันอยู่บ้านเพื่อท่านจะได้คอยดูแลฉัน	มม	คม	ม
104.	ทำให้ฉันรู้สึกว่าท่านไม่ได้รักฉันเลย	มม	คม	ม
105.	มีกฎข้อบังคับมากเกินกว่าที่ฉันจะจำได้	มม	คม	ม
106.	พูดว่าฉันทำให้ท่านมีความสุข	มม	คม	ม
107.	จะพูดกับฉันซ้ำแล้วซ้ำอีกว่าฉันเคยทำอะไรไม่ดีไว้บ้าง	มม	คม	ม
108.	ปล่อยให้ฉันทำอะไรก็ได้ตามที่ฉันอยากจะทำ	มม	คม	ม

Appendix F

A Brief About Thailand

Appendix F

A Brief About Thailand*

Area: 513,115 sq kilometers.

Temperature Range: 35°C (95°F) in June to 21°C (70°F) in February.

Population: 55.89 million (31 December 1989). 28.00 million males and 27.89 million females.

Capital City: Bangkok. Population 5.83 million. 2.92 males and 2.91 females.

Form of Government: Thailand is a constitutional monarchy. The King exercises his executive and legislative powers through Parliament and a Council of Ministers, and his judicial power through the courts of law. The local administrative system is highly centralized, with the government controlling all agencies of policy and power.

Head of State: King Bhumibol Adulyadej (Rama IX).

Economic System: Thailand's economy operates essentially on a free-trade system in which the private sector plays a dominant role. Investment in various economic sectors is open to capital from every corner of the world. Promotional privileges from the government are also granted to projects deemed beneficial to the country's economy.

Gross National Product: 1,682,700 million baht (1989).

GNP per Capita: 30,174 baht (1989).

Major Exports (1989): Textile Products, Rice, Rubber and Rubber Products, Jewelry & Precious Stones, Computers & Parts, Tapioca Products, Canned Seafood, Frozen Seafood, Integrated Circuits, Sugar, Footwear, Furniture & Parts, Electrical Appliances, Plastic Products, Leather and Leather Products,

---

* The Business Publications. (1990). *Thailand industrial buyer's guide* (9th ed.). Bangkok: Louis Printing.

	Canned Pineapple, Toys, Wood Products, Electronic Ball Bearings, Ceramics, Artificial Flowers, Clocks & Watches.
Foreign Exchange Reserves:	US$10,509 million (1989).
Payments:	No difficulties with payments for exports to Thailand.
Exchange Rate System:	The Thai Baht is managed by the Exchange Equalization Fund against a basket of currencies of the major trading partners, in which the US dollar features prominently.
Exchange Rate:	25.69 baht = US$1 (April 30, 1990) (25.42 baht - US$1, April 28, 1989)
Currency:	The Baht, which is divided into 100 Satangs. There are 500 baht, 100 baht, 50 baht, 20 baht, and 10 baht notes in circulation along with 5 baht, 1 baht, 50 satang and 25 satang coins.
Languages:	Thai is the national language. English and Chinese are widely used.
Religions:	Buddhism 94.1%, Islam 3.9%, and others including Christianity, Hinduism, and Sikhism 2%.
Time:	GMT + 7 hours.